

1649. A letter from the Administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the report on quarterly estimate of personnel requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1650. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the information for the purpose of making a determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency for the quarter ending September 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1651. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1652. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1653. A letter from the Chairman, War Manpower Commission, transmitting Bureau of the Budget Forms Nos. A-29 for the War Manpower Commission; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1654. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife; to the Committee on Claims.

1655. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1656. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Federal Security Agency for grants to States for old-age assistance, grants to States for aid to dependent children, grants to States for aid to the blind, and grants to States for unemployment compensation administration (H. Doc. No. 659); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 4780. A bill to fix the fees for domestic, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 30. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1451. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush,

and others," approved March 2, 1861; without amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1593. An act for the relief of the heirs and assigns of Widow Cesaire De Blanc; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5019. A bill to create and expand post-war employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 5020. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5021. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in central Alaska; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5022. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in southeastern Alaska; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5023. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5024. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the States for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5025. A bill to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Congress of Costa Rica, to the legislatures and heads of the Allied states engaged in the struggle for democracy, a message of support and affection on the occasion of the invasion of the continent of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 209 (f) of the Federal Social Security Act, defining "average monthly wage," to limit the elapsed quarters to those during which a wage earner was subject to the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5852. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution adopted by the Illinois Fuel Merchants Association, Chicago, Ill., presented by Robert M. Medill, director, department of mines and minerals, Springfield, Ill., petitioning the Government of the United States and the Bureau of Mines and Minerals to consider the State of Illinois as one of the sites for one of the proposed laboratories for the

hydrogenation of coal, shale, and other products to be explored in the United States of America by the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

5853. Also, resolution from Local Union 116, Progressive Mine Workers of America, Carrier Mills, Ill., signed by Charles Howe, president, and William Pearson, recording secretary, petitioning the Congress to amend the Social Security Act to the end that any person working in a covered industry, who becomes completely disabled, shall, upon proper proof of such disability, receive the same benefits for the remainder of life as if such person had reached the age required for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5854. Also, resolution from Local Union No. 165, Progressive Mine Workers of America, Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Hubert Sisk, president, and Paul Moore, recording secretary, petitioning the Congress to amend the Social Security Act to provide that any person working in a covered industry, who becomes completely disabled, shall, upon proper proof of such disability, receive the same benefits for the remainder of life as if such person had reached the age required for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5855. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 11 of the State Senate of California referring to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5856. By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, containing 120 signatures, opposing enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or distribution of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5857. By the SPEAKER: Petition of various real estate owners, banks, and agents of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the inequities in the rent control section of the present Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and comfort, Thou knowest that upon us are desperate days when even our prayers are fashioned in agony and moistened with tears. Out of the depths we cry unto Thee as the thunder of battle bombards our ears and anxious yearnings grip our hearts. The things for which in more tranquil days we crave and strive grow suddenly small and pale into insignificance as, with a devoted love that has nothing left for its expression but prayer, we defy the long miles and in constant companionship are by the side of our fighting sons. Thou knowest, too, that their tired faces haunt our hours, as with the rockets' red glare and with bombs bursting in air they carry on for the joy of victory that is set before them, the triumph of liberty and decency.

While we fervently pray that the habitations of violence may be destroyed, we

pray, too, that Thou wilt cleanse us from moral pollution, from mental darkness. With the awful cost of another chance to build a fairer world ever before us, in ground plowed by such sacrifice save us from sowing seeds today that will bring but a bitter harvest of ill will and revenge to torment our children's children. Grant, we pray Thee, that we may not in such a day seek selfishly great things for ourselves but high things for civilization and mankind. Even as with the stern determination that we wage war against evil, so may we devote ourselves to the sacrificial service of peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 13, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 13, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

- S. 754. An act for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland;
- S. 891. An act for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins;
- S. 1081. An act to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish Refuge;
- S. 1093. An act for the relief of Fermin Salas;
- S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonger;
- S. 1247. An act for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.;
- S. 1305. An act for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis;
- S. 1335. An act to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202);
- S. 1355. An act for the relief of Robert C. Harris;
- S. 1553. An act for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot;
- S. 1660. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing, in Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street, in Brainerd, Minn.;
- S. 1837. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hugh A. Shiels, United States Naval Reserve;
- S. 1944. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; and
- S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 13th instant,

During the last recess of the Senate the following message was received from the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Senate: That the Speaker had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning

World War No. 2 veterans, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. GILLETTE) on June 13, 1944.

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 13th instant,

During the last recess of the Senate Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. McCARRAN), from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, reported it on June 13, 1944, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 965) thereon.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING RECESS—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the 13th instant,

During the last recess of the Senate Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing on June 14, 1944:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 64, after line 22, insert the following:

"Migration of workers: To enable the War Manpower Commission to provide, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Chairman of said Commission for the temporary migration of workers from foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere (pursuant to agreements between the United States and such foreign countries), for employment in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the war effort, including the transportation of such workers from points outside the United States to ports of entry of the United States and return (including transportation from place of employment in the United States to port of entry of the United States in any case of default by an employer to provide such transportation to a worker, in which event the employer shall be liable to the United States for the cost thereof), cost of temporary maintenance of workers in reception centers in foreign countries and in the United States, when necessary, reasonable subsistence and emergency medical care of such workers from the time of reporting for transportation to the United States or return to the country of origin until arrival at the destination, necessary assistance to meet emergency health and welfare problems while in the United States, when such assistance is not otherwise available to such persons, and guaranties of employment while in the United States to the extent agreed upon with the foreign country from which the workers are imported, \$2,465,000, of which not to exceed \$123,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses necessary for the foregoing, including not to exceed \$12,000 for temporary employment of administrative personnel outside continental United States, not to exceed \$1,000 for printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed \$25,800 for travel expenses: *Provided*, That no trans-

portation of workers shall be allowed hereunder unless the employer and the worker have entered into a contract for employment approved by said Chairman or his designee, and unless said Chairman certifies that reasonably adequate use is being made of local labor supply: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall remain available after June 30, 1945, for the purpose of fulfilling guaranties and other obligations theretofore incurred with respect to such foreign workers and for all other purposes connected with the protection and ultimate return of any workers theretofore transported: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the recruitment or transportation of workers for employment in agriculture."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4899, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Under authority of the order of the 13th instant, during the last recess of the Senate, Mr. REED submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 48, after line 6, insert as a new paragraph:

"Temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons: For expenses necessary to enable the Federal Security Administrator to provide temporary aid, not to extend beyond the duration of the existing war and 6 months thereafter, to enemy aliens and other persons excluded from areas designated pursuant to authority contained in Proclamations No. 2525 of December 7, 1941, and 2526 and 2527 of December 8, 1941, and Executive Order No. 9066 of February 19, 1942, or whose normal means of livelihood has been interrupted by reasons of restrictions imposed by the Attorney General or any law or order authorizing the removal of persons whose presence may be deemed dangerous to the United States, and to the dependents of any of such persons, \$50,000: *Provided*, That funds may be transferred with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to this appropriation from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority," in an amount not exceeding \$50,000, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation and the whole administered and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may make expenditures from this appropriation, by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as he may designate, expenditures by such other agencies to be without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil-service and classification laws."

Mr. REED also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4899, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes,

which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. BARRY, Mr. MONROE, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GAMBLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill (S. 1808) to authorize temporary appointment as officers in the Army of the United States of members of the Army Nurse Corps, female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, female dietetic and physical-therapy personnel of the Medical Department of the Army (exclusive of students and apprentices), and female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such department as female dietetic or physical-therapy personnel, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its amendment to the title of the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4937) making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2711) for the relief of Mrs. Milfred Maag.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and

joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3150. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929;

H. R. 4659. An act to authorize the Soil Conservation Service to lend certain equipment;

H. R. 4867. An act to extend the health regulations of the District of Columbia to Government restaurants within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4881. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code, the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to classify a new synthetic drug, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4916. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934 (Public Law No. 435, 73d Cong.);

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1945, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1945; and

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock and for other purposes;

H. R. 3476. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath drainage district and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4771. An act to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves;

H. R. 4833. An act to extend, for 2 additional years, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; and

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution providing for operation of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND MATERIAL (S. DOC. NO. 203)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. GILLETTE] laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, relating to Senate Resolution 195, agreed to March 14, 1944, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 13, 1944.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 195 which was considered and agreed to on March 14, 1944, and which is here quoted:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes; (2) the adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property; and (3) those modifications in the methods of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities. The President is requested to report to the Senate within 3 months after adoption of this resolution and at intervals of not more than 3 months thereafter until such study is completed, concerning the results thereof together with his recommendations.

In compliance with this resolution I submit here my initial report and recommendations with respect to the vital matters of war surpluses and Federal property management in general.

I. CHARACTER AND EXTENT OF WAR SURPLUSES

While useful information is being assembled with respect to property which is now surplus, and procedures have been established in the armed services for accelerating the determination and declaration of surpluses, it is impossible at this time to give figures even as to existing surpluses upon which any over-all reliance can be placed.

I am advised by the War Department that during the first three-quarters of the fiscal year 1944 it disposed of excess property, other than real estate, valued at approximately \$260,000,000, of which \$99,000,000 was redistributed within the War Department, \$39,000,000 was transferred to other Federal agencies, \$62,000,000 represented sales of industrial property and \$60,000,000 represented salvage sales. With respect to real estate, four industrial facilities, costing over \$95,000,000, have been declared surplus under regulations of the Surplus War Property Administration, plant protection land costing approximately \$15,000,000 has been leased for agricultural purposes and 14 command and 4 industrial installations have been or are being transferred to the Navy Department.

The Navy Department in the fiscal year 1943, the latest period for which figures are now available, disposed of approximately \$35,000,000 of surplus property.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation reports that, between January 1 and May 31, 1944, it disposed of over \$52,000,000 in surplus property and that it has approximately \$90,000,000 available for disposal. These figures represent largely property owned by that corporation and its subsidiaries, and only in very small degree property declared surplus by other agencies. The largest element in both figures represents machine tools and production equipment, but most of this class of property listed as available for disposition has not yet been declared surplus by the sponsoring service.

The Procurement Division of the Treasury Department had on hand on January 1, 1944, \$16,880,502 of surplus property, and during the next 5 months acquired \$67,075,194 and disposed of \$53,733,809, leaving it with a balance on May 31, 1944, of \$30,221,887. The classes of property in which disposals during the period exceeded \$5,000,000 were textile basic manufactures, steel, construction and other machinery and motor vehicles.

The Maritime Commission, during the period January 1 to May 31, 1944, disposed of nearly \$19,000,000 of surplus property, \$15,000,000 being transferred between contracts, \$2,000,000 transferred to other Government agencies and \$2,000,000 sold. Surplus property available for disposal at the end of the period amounted to over \$5,000,000 with \$11,000,000 being screened for possible use by other Maritime Commission activities.

The Foreign Economic Administration reports that during the period from January 1 to May 31, 1944, it disposed of \$6,469,979 of surplus property of which \$4,803,777 was disposed in this country and \$1,666,202 abroad. As of May 31, 1944, it had on hand \$20,856,978 of surplus property of which \$1,836,233 was located in this country and \$19,020,745 abroad.

I have not received similar detailed figures from the War Food Administration, but I am advised by that agency that most of its disposals of food have been made to meet urgent civilian requirements, and that the amount of food which it now has on hand, and which might be regarded as surplus, is very small.

With respect to property which may become surplus in the future, the problem is even more difficult. Such incalculable factors as the duration of the various phases of the war, the accompanying destruction of property and the size of our post-war Military and Naval Establishments are prerequisites to any accurate forecast as to surpluses. The following estimate by the War Department as to surplus industrial property which will be available for disposition in the immediate future is, however, of considerable interest:

Termination inventories which the War Department has taken over or will take over in connection with pending contract terminations.....	\$270,000,000
Surplus property (excluding production equipment) in Government storage, in course of being reported to disposal agencies.....	21,000,000
Surplus property (excluding production equipment) in Government storage, reported to disposal agencies.....	7,000,000
Total.....	298,000,000

It is hoped that more detailed data in various fields will be developed by the date of the next report under Senate Resolution 195.

II. ADEQUACY OF CURRENT RECORDS

The records and inventory controls of the executive branch of the Federal Government fall generally into subdivisions representing particular classes of prop-

erty, such as (a) real property; (b) raw and semiprocessed materials; (c) operating, military, and naval equipment and supplies and (d) office equipment and supplies. Obviously, the character of agency activity determines the extent to which these various elements appear in the records of the several agencies.

Inspection of agency records and informal discussions with agency representatives indicate that there are wide variances between and within agencies in the philosophy and method of recording and controlling property. These variations exist with respect to the purposes for which inventory records have been established and are maintained, the administrative levels at which they are maintained, the extent to which the records are used as devices for property management, and the nomenclature used to indicate the character of property represented by the records. It is apparent that each agency has devised its own method of recording property under its custody—in most cases strictly as elementary records for accountability purposes—and therefore no common pattern has been followed. Consequently, the assembly of complete data concerning surpluses or the development of comprehensive totals of property owned by the Federal Government cannot be accomplished within any reasonable period.

I offer the following brief observations concerning the inventory practices of the several agencies.

War Department

Existing records do not provide accurate or complete information of surpluses. The difference in nomenclature in use by divisions of the department prevents uniformity of reports; however, a program has been instituted to improve the quality of the record data.

Military matériel: An early determination of surpluses is dependent upon a careful assessment of requirements and resources which process is extremely difficult under existing methods. The War Department procurement schedules are designed at all times to furnish the matériel at the proper time and in the correct quantities. Future requirements are based upon the best available military operational plans. Constant scrutiny of these plans in the light of changing military requirements is promptly reflected in the procurement program. This, along with adjustment of production schedules, is designed to prevent the creation of surpluses. Despite the foregoing preventive measures surpluses do accrue but are soon detected.

Airplanes: Army Air Forces is now preparing to establish at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, a centralized, up-to-date inventory system which will reflect at all times the production machinery and equipment owned by the War Department and for which the Army Air Forces is accountable.

A perpetual inventory kept up to date on the basis of daily change reports, and checked monthly against a physical inventory, is now maintained for all airplanes within the continental United States. Daily reports of airplanes on

hand are received from overseas theaters. Salvage warehouses have been established for the assembly and disposal of excess and obsolete parts and equipment as well as scrap.

Industrial facilities and production equipment: Detailed production equipment inventories have been established in field offices to record make, size, type, f. o. b. cost, and age of all machine tools and major items of other production equipment. Complete detailed plant inventories are being made of the plants wholly owned by the War Department.

A new directive will be issued shortly to expedite the assembly of inventory details at one central office of the Department. In addition to this modification, War Department procedures are to be revised so that surplus real estate will be brought into focus and made available for disposal.

Overseas facilities: Beginning in July 1942 reports have been submitted to the War Department quarterly by overseas commanders containing general information regarding facilities which are available and being constructed at each post, camp, and station within a command—except the European theater of operations, which submits a summarized report—including capacities, estimated costs, type of construction, and other pertinent details.

The Navy Department

Records of Navy inventories currently maintained are two general types, viz, (a) stock records posted by the activity holding the material and (b) central records of all holdings, posted or accumulated at a central control point.

The coverage of the former is practically universal. All activities, including extracontinental supply depots, maintain stock records, on a current basis, of material in their inventories. As a general rule, they provide for the posting of all receipts, issues, pending orders, and the balance on hand. They are the basic record used in preparing estimates of future needs and also in declaring material to be in excess of local needs.

In the case of central inventory records, the coverage at this time is not as complete as is the coverage of the field records. The Navy has been forced, in some cases, under the pressure of expediting the war effort, to forego the development of a comprehensive central inventory reporting system. However, the Navy has been able to develop and operate central inventory controls in such important fields as specialized ship components, advance base material, ammunition, and ordnance components, as well as many items of ordnance spare parts, controlled materials, fuel, food, clothing, all standard stock, aeronautical supply, and maintenance material, medical materials and in several other large spare and maintenance material fields. In most cases, it has not been practicable to include in these central records the inventories of material shipped overseas. However, the Navy has been able to maintain control through a reporting and distribution system of surplus Government-owned materials in private shipyards and is now

engaged in seeking further refinements in this procedure.

United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration: The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration maintain records of their own inventories, and individual shipyards are required by the Maritime Commission to maintain similar records. The Maritime Commission recently created a committee known as the Procedure Committee for Contract Terminations and Cancellations and Surplus Property Disposal. The Chairman of this committee has recommended that the Vice Chairman of the Maritime Commission require its regional directors to report each month information as to material declared unrequired in each contractor's plant as a means of shifting items and securing maximum utilization of stocks. The Commission's procurement division is now refining the procedure of recording such material to comply with the regulations of the Surplus War Property Administration.

The War Food Administration

The War Food Administration has current records and inventory controls on all property owned or controlled by the various agencies of the Administration. The property is of all classes and types, thus making considerable variation in the actual inventory control records being maintained. In some instances individual cost figures are available by individual unit of property.

The records of commodities purchased in a raw or manufactured state for human or animal consumption are maintained in various offices throughout the country and include the quantity and value of each commodity. The commodities include American-Egyptian cotton, hemp, flax, milkweed floss pods, sugar, meats, dairy products, and a wide variety of other commodities purchased for ultimate lend-lease and other war purposes. Many farm labor camps are operated on a loan basis from other governmental agencies and portable utilities such as showers, laundries, and toilets have been placed in several of these camps and property records are maintained on such items.

A number of facilities designed for the processing of food were constructed with lend-lease funds under the control of the War Food Administration and property records and total cost data are available on these facilities.

National Housing Agency

This agency is still engaged in construction and its property controls have been tied in with its procurement program in order to assure that equipment and materials which are surplus to the needs of completed projects may be shifted to projects under construction. Before regional purchase requisitions are honored by the central office, surplus material in other regions must be utilized if it is at all feasible.

A property accountability system has been installed by the Federal Public Housing Authority. Upon the completion of each project a detailed inventory is taken and a record of all nonexpended

items is established at the project and in the regional office. Semiannually the property is checked against the inventory records.

In the case of the war housing conversion program, at present administered by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a detailed property account is maintained for each converted property. This account provides a description of the project including the type and quantities of equipment charged to it and the Government's investment therein.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

The records and inventory controls now maintained by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary corporations provide information with respect to the type, quantity, cost, location, and custody of all property owned by them or under their control. The Defense Supplies Corporation and the Metals Reserve Company are actively engaged in the procurement, stock piling, and disposition of commodities for war purposes, and, in certain instances, are providing the equipment and supplies incident to such procurement. The Rubber Development Corporation and the United States Commercial Company are engaged in similar activities under the Foreign Economic Administration, with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation serving as their fiscal agent.

Periodically the detailed accounts in the field are consolidated with those in the central office in order that the Corporation's detailed position with respect to a particular commodity may be presented.

Commodities owned by the corporations are stock-piled and are subject to War Production Board allocations. It should be pointed out in the case of the preclusive buying program of the United States Commercial Company, under which commodities are purchased in various foreign countries in order to keep them out of the hands of the Axis, that detailed inventory records are more difficult to obtain. This particular program, however, is relatively small and is decreasing in importance. Even here the quality of the records is steadily improving.

The war agencies

Agencies included in this group are: the Foreign Economic Administration, Office of Defense Transportation, Central Administrative Services, Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Price Administration, Smaller War Plants Corporation, War Production Board, Office of War Information, Office of Civilian Defense, Office of Censorship, Office of War Mobilization, and Office of Economic Stabilization.

The records in these offices vary in completeness and comprehensiveness. This condition exists notwithstanding the fact that the Central Administrative Services developed a standard system of nonexpended property-accounting records for the war agencies.

Old-line agencies

The agencies included in this group are those not included in any of the preceding groups. The character, purposes,

and adequacy of their records vary substantially. To a large extent, the records maintained by these agencies are used exclusively for accountability by fiscal divisions and play a relatively small part in operational planning or broad utilization programs.

Disposal agencies

The Surplus War Property Administration has thus far designated seven agencies as disposal agencies in accordance with Executive Order 9425, issued February 19, 1944. The agencies so designated are: Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Maritime Commission, War Food Administration, National Housing Agency, Federal Works Agency, and Foreign Economic Administration. In addition, all agencies have been granted limited authority to dispose of scrap and minor quantities of surplus.

The Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, having operated as a transferring and disposal agency under previous Executive Order 9235, had an inventory and control system in operation when it was designated to act in a similar capacity for the Surplus War Property Administration. The original system used is presently undergoing extensive revision. Mechanical recording methods are being adopted in each of the 11 field offices with consolidated records in the Washington office. All records are being established on the basis of the Federal Standard Commodity Classification System as required by the Surplus War Property Administration. All property declared to this disposal agency by the several agencies of the Government is recorded at the field office level and also in the central office at Washington by classification, location, and condition. All invitations issued for bids and all awards are reviewed and approved by the central office before issuance or decisive action by the regional office. It is hoped that the new system, when in full operation, will provide adequate record of surpluses made available to this agency for disposal.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has designated the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, and the Metals Reserve Company, as its official disposal units with Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan agencies serving as field reporting stations. Record and inventory control systems are being devised for these units along the general plan being established by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department.

The general system in use by the Maritime Commission for its own property will be used for recording and controlling surpluses declared to it at its central office in Washington.

Other disposal agencies are in various stages of establishing record and disposal systems but at this time they are not sufficiently developed to warrant discussion.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

I view the problems involved in the assembly, reporting and disposal of surpluses arising from the activities of a

war period as distinct from, but necessarily related to, the permanent management of the Government's investment in property and the disposal of surpluses during peacetime.

I have long been aware of the necessity for improvement in the methods, practices, and procedures with respect to property management within the executive branch of the Government. The Congress has never provided comprehensive legislation with respect to property management, of which inventory and record controls are basic. The several agencies have been left largely to their own devices for the procurement, recording, and control of property and therefore there is no common pattern for and no consolidated inventory of the capital investment of the Federal establishment.

Surpluses develop during peacetime operation of the huge Federal enterprise through excessive stocking, unnecessary duplication, lack of maximum utilization, agency curtailment or liquidation. Without adequate standards and controls for procurement, stocking and utilization of property, unauthorized augmentation of congressional appropriations by free and irrational transfer of cash equivalents from one agency to another result. The Congress has dealt with the subject of normal surplus disposal only in specific and isolated cases, and this feature of property management has been largely left to the discretion of changing agency heads.

Recognizing these fundamental weaknesses in the property-management structure of the executive branch of the Government I issued Executive Order 9235 on August 31, 1942. The authority of this order was necessarily limited by the absence of comprehensive legislative authority. The Bureau of the Budget was made responsible by this order for the establishment of certain standards, the obtaining of maximum utilization of personal property, reviewing and approving proposals of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department for the establishment of centralized stores and issue warehouses to replace like facilities of individual agencies, and to manage the transfer of surpluses between the several agencies.

Despite the limitations of Executive Order 9235, the Bureau of the Budget, in collaboration with the departments and agencies, has made considerable progress in the development and application of a standard commodity classification, has established principles which assure protection of the integrity of congressional appropriations in connection with interagency transfers of property, and has brought about the return to the Treasury of many millions of dollars. The Bureau will shortly issue to all executive departments guides toward improvement in the field of property management. Lacking legislative authority, no more positive action can be taken at this time.

Aware of the limitations of Executive Order 9235, I sent a message to the Congress on November 30, 1942, urging consideration of broad legislation dealing with the permanent management of

equipment, materials, and supplies, and the transfer and disposal of normal surpluses within the executive branch. After exhaustive studies and public hearings the House of Representatives on June 9, 1943, passed H. R. 2795, in a form which appeared to assure the attainment of the above objectives.

I again urge the passage of this type of legislation in order to provide a foundation for the permanent management of Federal equipment, materials, and supplies so that the conditions which I have reported herein may be effectively remedied and their recurrence prevented.

I also recommend that supplementary measures dealing with the disposal of war surpluses be considered and approved expeditiously so that this increasing problem can be authoritatively and effectively met and administered.

I hope to be able to submit to you more comprehensive information on the elements of Senate Resolution 195 in the successive reports which are requested by the resolution.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications thereof, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period April 1, 1944, to May 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii (transmitted through the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Interior Department) transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Journal of the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session, 1943 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the Secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, the Archivist of the United States, the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Deputy Alien Property Custodian, the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Acting Chairman of the National Mediation Board, the Executive Director of the War Refugee Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Acting Secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Director of the Office of Censorship, and the Officer in Charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective departments and offices for the quarter ending September

30, 1944, and also a revised estimate from the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending September 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 11

"Resolution relating to memorializing the President and Congress to amend section 209 (f) of the Federal Social Security Act, defining 'average monthly wage,' to limit the elapsed quarters to those during which a wage earner was subject to the act.

"Whereas section 209 (f) of the Federal Social Security Act now provides that the average monthly wage shall be obtained by dividing the total wages paid an individual before the quarter in which he died or became entitled to receive primary insurance benefits by three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before the quarter in which he died or became so entitled, excluding any quarter prior to the quarter in which he attained the age of 22 during which he was paid less than \$50 of wages, and any quarter, after the quarter in which he attained the age of 65 occurring prior to 1939; and

"Whereas the present provision results in discrimination against persons in employments which were not originally covered by the act, but have subsequently been covered since it includes only those wages earned while the wage-earner was subject to the act, but does not limit the elapsed quarters to the period of coverage, resulting in a lower average monthly wage for an individual who became subject to the act after 1937, though the time actually worked may be the same as that of an individual originally covered; and

"Whereas this discrimination would be removed by limiting not only the wages to those earned while subject to the act, but limiting the elapsed quarters likewise: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to amend section 209 (f) of the Federal Social Security Act to limit the divisor of elapsing quarters to those during which the wage earner was subject to the act, to conform with the provision that only those wages earned while the wage earner was subject to the act are included in total wages, and to make this amendment retroactive to include all wage earners covered prior to its enactment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Louisiana, memorializing Congress to provide for the continued operation of the aluminum plant at Baton Rouge, La., operated for the Defense Plant Corporation by the Aluminum Co. of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. ELLENDER on the 12th instant, p. 5749, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Yugoslav Club, of San Pedro, Calif., pledging its loyal support to the President of the United States in the present war, and also relating to recognition of the National Anti-Fascist Liberation Coun-

oil as the sole representative of democratic Yugoslavia, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution by the board of directors of the Council on Books in Wartime, New York City, N. Y., relating to books and literature for members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution by the Metal Trades Council, of Seattle, Wash., favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of congressional proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

A resolution by Racine (Wis.) Screw Local No. 561, U. A. W.-C. I. O., favoring the making of an adequate appropriation for the Fair Employment Practice Committee; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Frank N. Johnson, of Portsmouth, Va., and sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend and strengthen the Emergency Price Control Act; ordered to lie on the table.

PROTEST AGAINST DISCONTINUATION OF WORK IN CONNECTION WITH WAR EFFORT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Harper Chapter, No. 46, American War Dads, a patriotic organization with headquarters at Harper, Kans., asking that our Government see that there be no stoppage of work connected with the war effort. I ask unanimous consent to have the appeal printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and appropriately referred. In this connection it is interesting to note that William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, this week issued a statement through the official publication of his organization, announcing that all strikes in this country have been stopped.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARPER, KANS., June 13, 1944.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

In order to protect the lives of our sons and daughters in the armed forces, the National Council of the American War Dads this day, by unanimous action, respectfully requests that by law the Government of the United States by immediate action in every instance prevent the stoppage of work connected with the war effort.

HARPER CHAPTER, No. 46,
AMERICAN WAR DADS.

PROTEST AGAINST USE OF SOFT WHEAT IN ALCOHOL PRODUCTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the J. C. Lysle Milling Co., Leavenworth, Kans., one of the leading millers of the Middle West, protesting against the recent action of the War Food Administration in granting permission for use of soft wheat in alcohol production. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. I have received numerous other letters and telegrams of protest on the same subject, and I am in sympathy with the appeal which comes from these businessmen of Kansas.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAVENWORTH, KANS., June 8, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously protest recent W. F. A. permission for use of soft wheat in alcohol production. For past 2 years our company unable to buy sufficient soft wheat to meet flour requirements of our trade after deducting heavy farmers' feed requirements. Estimated balance of 1944 soft wheat crop is barely sufficient for normal milling requirements. Hope you will demand W. F. A. again restrict distillers' purchasers to hard wheat of which there promises to be an adequate supply.

THE J. C. LYSLE MILLING CO.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Munson; without amendment (Rept. No. 977); and

H. R. 3649. A bill for the relief of Mae Ekval; without amendment (Rept. No. 966).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 978);

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin; without amendment (Rept. No. 967); and

H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Arch A. Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 968).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of John H. Gradwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 969);

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of L. T. Gregory; with amendments (Rept. No. 970);

S. 1827. A bill for the relief of Oliver N. Knight; with amendments (Rept. No. 971);

H. R. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 972);

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of P. Audley Whaley; without amendment (Rept. No. 979);

H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck; without amendment (Rept. No. 973);

H. R. 3695. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased; with amendments (Rept. No. 980); and

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of J. G. Power and L. D. Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 974).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3301. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 981).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1371. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; with amendments (Rept. No. 975).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 4825. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Des Moines, Iowa, September 10 to 14, inclusive, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 976).

FELICITATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC OF ICELAND

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report back, without amendment, from the Committee on Foreign Relations House Concurrent Resolution 91, which is identical with

Senate Resolution 45, and that the House resolution be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) which was read, as follows:

Whereas the people of Iceland in a free plebiscite on May 20-23, 1944, overwhelmingly approved the constitutional bill passed by the Althing providing for the establishment of a republican form of government; and

Whereas the Republic of Iceland will be formally established on June 17, 1944: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses to the Icelandic Althing, the oldest parliamentary body in the world, its congratulations on the establishment of the Republic of Iceland and its welcome to the Republic of Iceland as the newest republic in the family of free nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, expressing the congratulations of the Congress of the United States to the Icelandic Althing on the attainment of independence by the Republic of Iceland. I ask that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Concurrent Resolution 45 is indefinitely postponed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 14, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1767. An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; and

S. 1849. An act for the relief of Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Dimler and Gwendolyn E. Dimler, his wife; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1996. A bill to provide for a study of multiple taxation of air commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1998. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Air Field; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1999. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 14, 1918, so as to eliminate the necessity of joining the United States as a party in proceedings to partition lands of full-blood members of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 2000. A bill to restore to active duty and to the active list certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2001. A bill to amend the act approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended (56 Stat. 1092; 50 App. U. S. C., Supp. III, 1001-17 inclusive), so as to more specifically provide for pay allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties, and other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of John T. Cooper; and

S. 2003. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Locke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2004. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry on the Tule Lake division of the Klamath reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 4659. An act to authorize the Soil Conservation Service to lend certain equipment; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4881. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code, the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to classify a new synthetic drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3150. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929;

H. R. 4867. An act to extend the health regulations of the District of Columbia to Government restaurants within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4916. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934 (Public Law 435, 73d Cong.);

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1945, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1945; and

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF ACT PROVIDING FOR THE RETIREMENT OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLMAN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1371) to amend an act en-

titled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Strike out all the matter appearing on page 10, between lines 3 to 16, inclusive, under the heading "Committee on Fair Employment Practice."

Mr. MAYBANK submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4879, making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, line 16, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the committee shall not accept or utilize utilize voluntary or uncompensated services."

On page 10, line 16, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the committee shall not perform its functions or duties or exercise its powers through any officials or agencies other than those of the committee."

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraphs 1 and 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 29, after line 19, insert the following:

"COMMITTEE FOR CONGESTED PRODUCTION AREAS

"Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Committee for Congested Production Areas to carry out the functions vested in it by Executive Order 9327, including travel expenses (not to exceed \$48,000); printing and binding (not to exceed \$2,550); purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed \$600); the employment of State, county, or municipal officials and employees, with or without compensation; and the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil service and classification laws (not to exceed \$15,000); \$669,000."

Mr. VANDENBERG also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4879, making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. DANAHER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice

in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 10, after line 2, insert the following:

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate such discrimination in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government as hereinafter set forth.

UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) to discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

To discriminate against any member, employer, or employee because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer or labor union within the scope of this act to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden by this act or because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

SCOPE OF ACT

SEC. 3. (a) This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ more than five persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; (2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof; or (3) performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party.

(b) This act shall apply to any labor union which has five or more members in the employ of one or more employers covered by the preceding paragraph.

(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices in the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that paragraphs (e) and (f) of section 10, providing for petitions for enforcement and review, shall not apply in any case in which an order has been issued against any department or independent agency of the United States; but in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act may petition the Attorney General of the United States for the enforcement of such order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the Attorney General to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order. Every official who willfully violates any such order shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. For the purpose of preventing unfair employment practices on the part of employers and labor unions, there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall consist of a chairman and six additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve for a term of 7 years except that the terms of the members originally appointed shall expire serially at intervals of 1 year. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause. Four members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

REPORTS

SEC. 5. The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Commission, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

SALARIES

SEC. 6. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

SEC. 7. Upon the appointment of the members of the Commission, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said Committee shall be transferred to and become employees of the Commission. All records, papers, and property of the Committee shall pass into the possession of the Commission, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the Committee shall be available to the Commission.

LOCATION OF OFFICES

SEC. 8. The Commission shall hold its sessions in the District of Columbia and at such other places as it may designate. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such referees, agents, or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry or conduct any hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 9. (a) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed, in the district of such person's residence not less than 7 nor more than 14 days after the serving of said complaint.

(b) The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to such complaint and to appear in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint.

(c) If upon all the testimony taken the Commission shall be of the opinion that any

person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including hiring or reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act. If, upon all the testimony taken, the Commission shall be of the opinion that no person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(d) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) or, if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application might be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States, within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair employment practice in question occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court to which petition is made shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures established by law governing petitions for enforcement of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

(e) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unfair employment practice in question was alleged to have occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. Upon such filing, the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures established by law governing petitions for review of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 10. (a) For the purpose of all hearings and investigations which in the opinion of the Commission are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to subpoena the production of the books, records, or other evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation or in question, before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or investigation. Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required at any designated place of hearing in the district wherein the respondent resides or transacts business.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, any district

court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(c) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 11. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such regulations shall be effective 60 days after transmission to the Congress unless the Congress has in the interim amended or nullified such regulations by appropriate legislation or has adjourned within 10 days after the submission of such regulations. Such regulations shall set forth the procedure for service and amendment of complaints, for intervention in proceedings before the Commission, for rules of evidence to be applied by the Commission, for the taking of testimony and its reduction to writing, for the modification of the findings or orders prior to the filing of records in court, for the service and return of process and fees of witnesses, and with respect to the seal of the Commission, which shall be judicially noticed, the payment of expenses of members and employees of the Commission, the qualification and disqualification of members and employees and any other matters appropriate in the execution of the provisions of this act.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 12. (a) All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter negotiated or renegotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and requiring him to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

(b) Unless the Commission shall otherwise determine and state in its order, no contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person found by the Commission to have violated any of the provisions of this act or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until 3 years have elapsed from the date when the Commission determines such violation to have occurred. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all agencies of the United States containing the names of such persons.

OFFENSES AND PENALTIES

SEC. 13. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its

referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of such act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 15. (1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

(2) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of any employer, directly or indirectly.

(3) The term "labor union" includes any organization in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning the terms or conditions of employment.

(4) Unless otherwise specified, the term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission created by section 4 of this act.

(5) The term "Committee" means the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943.

(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia, or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or Territory, or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

SEC. 16. This act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act."

Mr. DANAHER also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4879, making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF POSTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MOORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. WEEKS, and Mr. BUCK) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 310), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as follows:

Whereas on March 9, 1942, the Postmaster General requested a change in existing law to "authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time." In making that request, the Postmaster General further stated, "The amendment . . . would not increase the cost of postal service to the Nation." The cost of this item for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, was \$10,396,420; and

Whereas in the fiscal year immediately following that of June 30, 1943, the expenditure for this item was \$61,003,199. The expenditure for this item for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, is stated as \$67,557,000, and the estimate for 1945 for this item is \$69,777,200; and

Whereas the records of the Post Office Department show that the First Assistant Post-

master General, in May 1943, and again in December 1943, admonished postmasters responsible for the recommendations on which these expenditures are based as follows: "From our study of the estimates and expenditures submitted by postmasters, it is concluded that there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused."; and

Whereas it is obvious on the face of the record and the information available that instead of there being "no increase in cost" as stated by the Postmaster General, and on which recommendation the Congress acted and amended the law as requested, the effect of the change has been an increase of some \$60,000,000 annually: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate be authorized and directed to make an investigation of the operation and administration of the Post Office Department, with particular reference to this question and the facts outlined herein. The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is also authorized and directed to broaden the inquiry so as to cover any relevant matters contained within the current administration of postal affairs and to make such a report with such recommendations as its inquiry and its investigation may determine to be advisable or necessary.

PLATFORM ISSUES—ARTICLES BY WENDELL WILLKIE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles on platform issues written by Wendell Willkie, one under the heading "Social security," published in the Washington Post of June 14, 1944, and the other under the heading "Post-war economy," published in the Washington Post of June 15, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR COOPER, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Prentice Cooper, Governor of Tennessee, on June 6, 1944, before the Democratic State convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. HOMER CUMMINGS BEFORE CONNECTICUT STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Homer Cummings, former United States Attorney General, at the Democratic State convention held at New Haven, Conn., on May 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. FARLEY'S RESIGNATION—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD (CONN.) DAILY COURANT

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Farley's Resignation," published in the Hartford Daily Courant of June 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW YORK SOLDIERS MAY BE DISFRANCHISED—EDITORIAL FROM THE BUFFALO STAR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New York Soldiers May Be Disfranchised," published in the Buffalo Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO VOID POLL TAX—LETTER FROM IRVING BRANT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of the power of Congress to void the poll tax, written by Irving Brant to the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TRULY RESTS—LETTER FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "Where Constitutional Power Truly Rests" from the New York Sun of Saturday, June 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TIMID PLANNING—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Timid Planning Can Botch the Job" from the Chicago Sun of May 24, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE OF WAGES OF WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I notice that the other day the House of Representatives refused to adopt my amendment which the Senate had previously adopted to the O. P. A. extension law. The amendment provided in substance that when the employer and employee could agree it would not be necessary to obtain the authority of Government to sanction the agreement if the wage scale agreed upon did not exceed \$37.50 a week.

I was informed that from the fox holes on the home front and from the bureau drawers of all the bureaucracy in the city pressure was brought to bear, the House responded, and as a result the amendment went out of the bill. I hope the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], when the conferees meet, will see to it that my amendment remains in the bill.

My purpose in taking the floor this morning is to urge that the conferees, whoever they may be, will insist on doing equity to this group, the white-collar workers, by keeping my amendment in the bill. While organized labor has increased its weekly earnings more than 69 percent in the past 5 years, it appears that the clerical and semiprofessional white-collar worker has received an increase so meager that it does not offset the increased cost of living. The fact of the matter is that the unorganized groups are virtually subsidizing the workers of the organized groups. They are paying a penalty for their specialized skill and knowledge and in many instances their higher education.

What I am asking for in the amendment is a better balance of income for all our citizens. What chance has Mary Jones the school teacher, or Pete Smith the bookkeeper, or Carl Brown the clerk, or Susie Brown, his sister, who is employed in a city, county, or municipal office to receive prompt attention to her or his individual problem? There is a lack of balance in the income the white-collar worker has been getting compared to what other classes have received. I am serious about the situation of the white-collar worker; and following the language of him who speaks at the other end of the Avenue, I will repeat again and again and again that we had better do a little equity to the 20,000,000 of these folks. The men and women in the white-collar class have no one to represent them in Washington; they have no organization back of

them; they are the "forgotten men." I ask that we do justice to this group. Here is what I said about the white-collar worker months ago:

Fellow Americans, what has happened to that phantom figure, the "forgotten man," society's specter of neglect for the past 11 years and some months? He is still with us, but as a new group, the white-collar worker. Forgotten? He is, indeed. Recalled to our attention some months ago, with great sympathy, by the President in his veto message on the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidies bill, again he is in limbo.

To my mind, we no longer can call him the "forgotten man." He has been disinherited, abandoned. We have cast him aside. This group constitutes one of the greatest sections of our consuming purchasing public. Fifteen million heads of families are involved, but to this moment none of them, or at least a very few, have found any, or but little, increase in the weekly pay envelope.

Since they are clerical, white-collar, and unorganized employees, they are unable to take advantage of the National War Labor Board's good offices. They are victims of prosperity, unable to compete as individuals for the better things of life or to voice their demands as a group. They are penalized for their own individuality, and we are allowing a growing problem to get beyond control.

This group is slowly being forced to write its living standard downward, and in the meantime they are being forced into debt to maintain even their present standard, while their laboring brother climbs higher and higher, day by day, into the brackets of high incomes and proportionately higher living.

What we do not realize is that it is not alone the white-collar classes which will suffer. We reduce their purchasing power and what happens? Obviously, labor is affected; agriculture, industry, commerce are affected. Everyone, including Government, is eventually affected.

Whatever our plan, our post-war economic security depends upon immediate action. The problem of the "forgotten man" cannot be solved by forgetting it. No one is to profit if this great important group in our economic fabric is to be ignored, resulting in a very low standard of living, or else a greatly increased individual debt. Billions of dollars in savings and war surpluses will be of no value if we are to destroy one of our greatest purchasing markets or destroy within them their self-respect as a class because they cannot hold their heads high with their fellow citizens—the laborer, the farmer, and the industrial worker.

The square thing—the fair thing—to do is to permit the white-collar worker to get reasonable compensation for his labor.

My thought is that when these folks who have not been getting anything out of this war wake up and realize who it is that is stopping them from getting justice, what party it is that is stopping them from getting equity, they will exercise their right of franchise next fall and speak with clarity and definiteness. It was a solid administration phalanx that stopped my amendment in the House.

I know it is said if the wages of the white-collar workers were to be increased to \$37.50 a week, it would be a great contributing factor toward inflation. Let us see about that. It has been estimated that in probably 10,000,000 cases the employer and the employee might agree that wages should go up to \$37.50 a week, representing perhaps an increase of \$5 a week, or approximately \$250 a

year for each individual. That would make an increase of \$2,500,000,000 in the pockets of those who have been denied a living wage and who have seen their living standards go down, down, and down because Congress has not seen fit to recognize them. I repeat, they have no organization; they have no organized spokesmen. They are the clerks, the school teachers, and the municipal employees. They are the folks who are doing the work without getting the gravy. They are that class of American citizens who have always been the bulwark of America. Two billion five hundred million dollars in their pockets, which would increase their standard of living, would not contribute in the slightest to inflation.

Mr. President, I repeat, I trust that the conferees, when they go to conference on this matter, will, for the sake of the people who deserve it the most, see to it that the amendment to which the Senate agreed remains in the bill.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Truman
Butler	McClellan	Tunnell
Byrd	McFarland	Tydings
Capper	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Weeks
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Willey
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Pepper	
Gerry	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr.

O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE HOG, CATTLE, POULTRY, AND DAIRY INDUSTRIES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for months, a group of United States Senators who are particularly interested in the production of agriculture and livestock, have brought to the attention of the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other agencies, acute problems affecting the marketing of all classes of cattle, hogs, sheep, poultry, and eggs; and other agricultural products including wheat, corn, and so forth, as well as matters pertaining to directives and orders, which have been issued by Government agencies, and which in many cases have apparently demoralized their markets.

The history of the meetings held, and the suggestions offered by the interested Senators as mentioned above—and, by the way—the Senators referred to come from both sides of the aisle, but are largely from the Middle Western States—are set out in detail in a letter written by them on June 1, 1944, to Marvin Jones, Claude R. Wickard, and Chester Bowles. The letter is self explanatory. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 1, 1944.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
HON. CHESTER BOWLES,
Price Administrator.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is not written in the hope of affirmative action on the part of any of the agencies named that would tend to relieve the distressing situation regarding livestock production and livestock feed, especially in Midwestern States, known as the corn-hog belt. To these areas, where livestock production is in chaos, should be added the cattle-raising and cattle-fattening areas. Feeders of poultry the country over have also experienced disastrous conditions.

In the absence of any hope of beneficial action, this letter is prepared more as a history of what has transpired under clumsy and unintelligent bureaucratic attempts to regulate livestock feed and livestock production. It might well be termed, with due apologies to the late immortal William Shakespeare, "A tragedy of errors."

Anticipating an increased need for meat for food, and fats for all purposes, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, who had not yet been shorn of the powers of his office, on November 27, 1942, announced a hog price support program. The support price at Chicago was fixed at \$13.25 per hundred pounds for good to choice butcher hogs weighing from 240 to 270 pounds. Support prices at other markets were related to the Chicago base price. In addition to placing a floor under hog prices, Secretary Wickard consistently followed, while any power was left to him, a policy of keeping livestock prices relatively high and livestock feed-grain prices relatively low. This is the surest way known to increase livestock production, and especially hog production.

In April of 1943, Mr. Chester Davis, who had been appointed War Food Administrator, increased the support price of hogs at Chicago to \$13.75. Being of an independent turn of mind, and having a lot of common sense, as well as the confidence of agricultural interests generally, Mr. Davis did not last long as War Food Administrator. This is not said in disparagement of the Honorable Marvin Jones, who succeeded Mr. Davis as War Food Administrator. It is simply a statement of the facts.

In July 1943 Judge Jones, in a move to induce the marketing of hogs at lighter weights, changed the support-price basis to include Good to Choice butcher hogs weighing from 200 to 240 pounds. This was to continue until March 31, 1944. The original announcement by Secretary Wickard, and the Davis amendment, was for a period ending September 30, 1944.

In September 1943 Judge Jones amended his program so as to apply to 200- to 270-pound butcher hogs, and changed the period of expiration to September 30, 1944, which was the same expiration date as the Wickard and Davis orders.

In December 1943 the order was again amended so that the support weight of heavy hogs was increased to 300 pounds for a temporary period. Later, on January 27, 1944, the top weight was further increased to 320 pounds. On March 18, 1944, a further change was made. The top weight was reduced to 270 pounds, to be effective April 15, 1944.

On Monday, May 8, Judge Jones announced a lowering of the minimum support weight from 200 pounds down to 180 pounds.

We may assume that if there were not more than 10 or 12 individuals concerned in hog production and marketing, that number might have been kept well advised as to the circumstances surrounding their production and marketing. Considering the fact that some hundreds of thousands, perhaps more than a million, farmers raise and market corn and hogs, it is hardly surprising that the "corn-hog belt" farmer became utterly bewildered as to the best course for him to follow.

Let us turn now to the corn-hog program for the production angle. In 1941, 71,397,000 hogs were slaughtered. In September 1941 the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, seeing need for an increase, asked that the number of hogs for the 1942 slaughter be increased to 79,300,000. In January 1942 he asked for an increase in the goal mentioned to 83,000,000. As a matter of fact, the hog slaughter in 1942 turned out to be approximately 78,000,000 head. The hog-slaughter goal for 1943 was set at 97,000,000. The actual slaughter was 95,273,000.

There is always a decrease from the number of pigs brought into the world, as compared with the number that are fed and slaughtered. Not all of the litter produced by the mamma pig attains maturity. So, in October 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture requested a 10-percent increase in the spring pig crop of 1942. The actual increase was somewhat larger than that.

In November 1942 the Secretary of Agriculture set the pig-crop goal of 1943 at 121,000,000 head. The actual pig crop of 1943 was 122,000,000, only a fraction of 1 percent above the goal set. Considering the fact that pig birth control has not yet reached the proportions of an exact science, this is a remarkably close approximation to what was desired. The pig farmer was doing his best. Of the total pig crop about 60 percent is produced in the spring and 40 percent in the fall.

This statement is made because of the constant insinuations made by the War Food Administration, O. P. A., and other bureaucratic agencies, that the greedy, grasping, corn-hog farmer, in an inordinate desire for profit, greatly exceeded the goal set by the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. The facts do not justify any such conclusions. The truth is that the corn farmer and the hog growers were doing their best to meet the goal set by official authority.

Along with the increase in the number of hogs, which had been asked for, there was also an increase in the number of poultry in the country, which had been asked for. The number of cattle, both dairy and beef, also increased.

The years 1942 and 1943 produced phenomenal crops of corn and other feed grains. However, along after the middle of 1943, some doubt arose as to the sufficiency of feed grains to finish out all of the livestock which had been brought into existence through the urging of the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator.

PROTEIN FEEDS

Along in the latter part of 1942, a shortage in the availability of protein feeds for livestock producers became evident. As time went on, these feeds became more and more scarce. There was universal complaint from all the Middle Western States. Cattle producers were unable to obtain a sufficient supply through the winter of 1942 to keep their breeding stock in proper shape. Livestock feeders were unable to obtain the protein feeds usually available for finishing out their high-grade market cattle. Senators and Representatives from all the Western States discussed this situation numerous times with officials of the various agencies, beginning with the Secretary of Agriculture. Kansas delegation memoranda, alone, show about 18 conferences of various sorts, with various officials, all dealing with the same subject matter. Other States had about the same experience. Little, if any, relief was afforded from 1942 through practically all of 1943.

If an ample corn supply had been available for feeding purposes, in the absence of protein feeds, the situation would not have been so completely disastrous. This was one of the most vexatious phases of the whole problem. All of us who participated in the discussions felt helpless in the face of the inadequacies of the bureaus and bureaucratic personnel handling these questions.

CORN

We now come to what is perhaps the sorest point among all sore points in the corn-hog feed situation:

The corn crop of 1942 was the largest on record. Notwithstanding the enormous crop of that year, it soon became evident, even after the size of the crop was determined, that corn was not moving into consumptive channels. Complaints from cattle feeders, outside the principal corn-producing territory, over their inability to buy corn in anything like their normal requirements, became more and more numerous. Unfavorable conditions for the planting of the 1943 crop, in the spring of 1943, increased the stringency in available corn. By this time, the number of cattle and hogs had reached record

proportions. Most favorable corn-growing weather, after a late start, produced a corn crop second in size only to the 1942 crop. Notwithstanding these two record crops in succession, it became fully evident, as 1943 went by, that the whole corn situation was out of joint. Not in the memory of those of us who have been in the public service through most of our lives, have we ever witnessed so much dissatisfaction, confusion, and uncertainty. This naturally produced many complaints from livestock producers, which came to us in the latter part of 1943, continuing through the winter of 1943-44. These complaints would still be coming in except that the complainants apparently have given up any hope for relief and, therefore, cease to take the trouble to make complaints. Otherwise, the loud cries from all over the Midwest would be continued to this day in even a larger volume.

In an effort to reach the situation, conferences of Midwestern Senators and Representatives, with officials of the W. F. A., O. C. C., O. F. A., O. D. T., and other agencies were numerous. These conferences ran through the entire year of 1943 in a more or less informal manner. We have a memorandum record of conferences, beginning with November 30, 1943, in which 17 Senators from 15 States participated. Other conferences, of which we have record, were held on December 28, January 6, January 12, May 6, and May 12. While discussion in these conferences covered the entire range of trouble, and each of the agencies named were represented by men in more or less authority, no relief of any consequence, at any time, was given.

The primary difficulty lies in an inept handling of all phases of this subject.

The price of No. 2 corn, and the price of Good to Choice hogs, weighing from 200 to 270 pounds, at Chicago, on the following dates was:

	No. 2 corn	"Good to choice" 200- to 270-pound hogs
Jan. 4, 1943.....	\$0.95	\$14.60 to \$15.
May 3, 1943.....	1.07	\$14.65 to \$14.85.
July 1, 1943.....	1.07	\$13.70 to \$13.95.
Oct. 1, 1943.....	1.07	\$14.85 to \$15.10.
Dec. 1, 1943.....	1.07	\$13.75.
Jan. 3, 1944.....	1.16	\$13.75.
Mar. 1, 1944.....	1.16	\$13.75 to \$13.90.

Source: Department of Agriculture, War Food Administration.

A glance at the prices quoted above will show the main reason why corn did not move into commercial channels. We have previously mentioned the policy of Secretary Wickard to keep livestock prices high and feed prices low so as to increase the number of livestock available for all purposes. This policy succeeded all too well. Normally, the value of 11.2 bushels of No. 2 corn, at Chicago, should equal the value of 100 pounds of hog. At the maximum spread between these values, 100 pounds of hog was worth as much as 15.8 bushels of corn. Of course, the corn farmer is not going to sell corn at 95 cents a bushel when by feeding it he can get \$1.34 per bushel for his crop. Time after time, the importance of reconciling the values between corn and hogs was urged upon those in authority in the O. P. A. and W. F. A. Perhaps we were mistaken, but we thought at the time that we made some impression on the W. F. A. No impression was made at any time upon these all-wise men, almost wholly without experience, handling these matters in the O. P. A. They knew all the answers except the right answer. The general inexperience and lack of understanding of the O. P. A. officials was only exceeded by their self-assurance.

On one occasion, the chairman of the conference was informed by an O. P. A. spokesman:

"Senator, we know how to handle these matters and you do not."

That remark came at a time in January 1944, when hogs were pressing on the market in such a volume as to congest the stockyards, requiring embargoes at different markets. It was wintertime. The best market for fresh pork is, of course, in cold weather. We were urging that a surplus of pork existed at that time, that attempting to ration a surplus makes no sense at all. We asked that rationing be raised for a temporary period until the hog glut could be relieved. As often as such a suggestion was made, it was disdainfully rejected. Senator THOMAS of Idaho went so far as to introduce Senate Resolution 231, requiring that pork rationing be temporarily suspended.

A completely unsatisfactory situation existed throughout this entire period. Then came the corn freeze order. In 125 counties in Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Indiana, producing the major part of the surplus corn of the country, farmers having surplus corn were forbidden to sell it—even to their neighbors needing it—except through the cumbersome red-tape method of securing a special permit through a special county board. That was the last blow. The markets couldn't handle all the hogs offered. Those that were sold were at the largest discount ever known under what might be termed "normal prices." At Chicago, Kansas City, and other markets, discounts on light hogs ran as high as \$4 per hundred pounds. On the heavy hogs, over the "support weight," the discount was as high as \$3.50 per hundred pounds. In recent weeks a peculiar situation has numerously appeared. The offering of hogs has been so heavy that on some occasions as many as 76,300 were held over because of an inability of buying to absorb the offerings. Surprising as it may be, the majority of the hold-overs were "support price" hogs. A second glance will determine why that was the case. Packers were buying hogs lighter and heavier than the "support price" range, at these great discounts, with greater profit to themselves. The farmer took the beating, even with his "support price" hogs. Frequently, these "support price" hogs had been held over from Saturday to Monday, after perhaps a previous delay of a day preceding Saturday.

Illustrating this situation, an Iowa farmer, under date of May 8, 1944, wrote:

"The price-support program on hogs has been a farce since last December. Today there are 11,000 hold-overs in Chicago, practically all of them Government weights. At least the market news on WHO said packers didn't even touch Government weights today. With the exception of a couple of weeks in April, packers have bought their requirements from the nonsupport weights first, and the hold-overs, which have been mostly Government-support weights, are bought 1 to 4 days later as medium hogs at \$1 to \$2 discount. This was the case at Sioux City and Chicago at least, through January and February. In interior Iowa markets it worked differently, but just as bad."

The corn-hog farmers have taken the worst beating in their history, measured by what should have been normal market conditions.

Finally, after warm weather came, and heat-producing meat no longer in great demand, the O. P. A. suspended rationing. That was precisely what the Senators signing this letter had been urging upon the O. P. A. for 5 months previously, but had been told they didn't know how to run this business and that the smart men in the O. P. A. did.

For weeks past, the freeze order has made it impossible for the farmer to buy corn to feed his hogs, and on the other hand, the

market could not absorb them without terrific losses to the hog producer. What is the farmer supposed to do under these circumstances?

At the last conference on May 12, Judge Jones made the statement that he "hoped to be able to raise the 'freeze' order on corn in a few days." The reason given for applying the freeze order was to get some 80,000,000 bushels of corn for various processors, including production of munitions. On the date of the conference, Judge Jones stated that the C. C. C. had succeeded in obtaining 45,000,000 bushels of corn out of the 80,000,000 stated to be necessary. (At other times, 72,000,000 bushels has been given as the goal to be reached for that purpose.) We are informed that on May 31, the total amount of corn actually bought, or under contract, by the C. C. C., is 51,350,000 bushels. In other words, the C. C. C. has increased the 45,000,000 bushels stated by Judge Jones on May 12, to 51,350,000 bushels on May 31. At this rate, the corn freeze order will not be lifted much before the next corn crop comes in, if the W. F. A. insists upon retaining its rigid ban upon all corn marketing, other than corn sold to the C. C. C. Various devices have been used to increase the flow of corn, but apparently none of them have been markedly successful.

This letter could be drawn out to an indefinite length. There is an unlimited amount of material of the same quality as that already included herein.

On the relation between the price of corn and the price of hogs, existing from the beginning of this year, farmers marketing hogs of support weight, received slightly more than the value of the grain. If the hogs were over the support weight, or under the support weight, the corn-hog farmer did not even receive the value of his grain. He took a ruinous loss. This is also true of farmers who took to market hogs of the support weight, but whose hogs could not be sold and were not sold at the support prices on the day he took them to market. Selling these good to choice hogs on the basis available, after being held 2 or 3 days, involved a loss to this class of farmer also. These effects are far reaching and touch a majority of livestock farmers.

So far as we know, not in all of agricultural history is there a record of Government bureaus attempting to carry out an important program that has been attended with so much stupidity, ineptitude, and general all around disregard of equities, as this. Government bureaus, in these war times, are clothed with authority to impose their will and their ideas, no matter how mistaken, on the farmer, and that authority has been used.

As stated in the beginning, we realize the time has passed when there is any hope for a correction of these mistakes, even if the bureaus were willing. The farmers have taken the loss. We do feel, however, that in justice to this important class of citizens, upon which the country depends in so many regards, the facts that we have set out, and the views we have expressed herein, should be spread on the record for all time to come.

That is the sole purpose of this letter.

Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED, KENNETH S. WHERRY,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, E. V. ROBERTSON, JOSEPH H. BALL, JOHN THOMAS, RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
GERALD P. NYE, CHAN GURNEY,
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, ARTHUR CAPPER,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN, HUGH BUTLER,
ALEXANDER WILEY, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, E. H. MOORE.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as a result of inept handling of the marketing problems of this great industry, today the livestock and the meat industries are in an extremely deplorable state of chaos

and confusion. Livestock producers are confused, discouraged, and embittered because of the unfair, discriminatory, and oppressive practices and policies which have been pursued.

Livestock herds are being liquidated at an alarming rate. Unless these policies are corrected the results will be disastrous to consumers, as well as to producers.

Mr. President, after I came to my office this morning I read and clipped a news release from the Washington Times-Herald of today entitled "Meat Shortage in Few Months Predicted." I ask unanimous consent that the news release may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT SHORTAGE IN FEW MONTHS PREDICTED

The Agriculture Department yesterday issued a less favorable forecast on civilian meat supplies in the next few months with indications that some meats may return to the ration list in the not-too-distant future.

Supplies will remain "large" through the July-September quarter, but will decline in quantity and quality as production drops seasonally and as noncivilian purchases increase, a survey said.

"The smaller supplies of better grades of meat available for civilian consumption in the coming months may accentuate difficulties in the distribution of meat, since such a large proportion of civilians are financially able to buy more meat of the better grades as well as choicer cuts," the Department reported.

Difficulties of distribution as well as short supplies have usually preceded Office of Price Administration rationing action.

Marketings of pork will decline seasonally in the July-September quarter, but beef and veal production will be slightly larger than in the first half of the year, the Department said. However, the beef will be of lower grade since late summer- and fall-marketed cattle are mostly "grass finished" in contrast to the "feed-lot finished" animals marketed earlier.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the hog market today is demoralized. This has been the condition for a period of weeks, and I will say, now, of months. Hog producers are being unfairly and unnecessarily penalized as a result of governmental policies and directives. Responding patriotically to the appeal of their Government, hog producers have produced the greatest supply of hogs on record. Although the Government promised to support the price of hogs, the price-support program has broken down. The Government is supporting prices of hogs weighing from 180 to 270 pounds. I am advised that some packers have been buying lighter-weight hogs and heavier-weight hogs outside the support-price range, at heavy discounts, because the prices of these hogs were not supported by the Government.

In some cases, producers have had to sell their heavy hogs at a discount of as much as \$2.50 to \$3.50 a hundred and the discounts on light hogs have run as high as \$4 a hundred at Chicago, Kansas City, and other markets.

Mr. President, 2 days ago I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr.

Henry Blaser, 1721 Seventh Street, Columbus, Nebr., enclosing an invoice which his son had just received from the commission firm in Omaha, Nebr. The invoice is self-explanatory. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the invoice may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and invoice were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS, NEBR., June 6, 1944.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHERRY: Enclosed please find a sales account of a truckload of hogs shipped by one of my sons in which I have two-fifths interest. You are no doubt aware that thousands of farmers could not ship out their livestock this year when they were ready on account of impassable roads for almost 2 months—but thank God, we needed that rain—but why that penalty on these sixteen 315-pound barrows which had just as good pork chops as the other 18 which weighed 255 pounds and were only a few days' difference in age. Now, Mr. WHERRY, there are hundreds of thousands of farmers over the great Corn Belt receiving such sales accounts nowadays. How long is this corruption going to last? We do not know, but we will keep on raising hogs and cattle in order to try and feed our boys and the rest of the world as far as possible, but I do hope that the Corn Belt farmers will wake up by next November and help us get a change in this dictatorship.

May God bless you, Mr. WHERRY, for all the good work you have done in the short time that you have been at our Capital.

Your friend and supporter,

HENRY BLASER.

Purchaser	Hogs	Weight	Price	Amount	Total
Armour....	18	4,595	13.45	\$618.02	
Do.....	16	5,045	11.00	554.95	
Total..	34	9,640			\$1,172.97
Truckers description of your livestock					
Rate, at 25 cents per hundred-weight.....				24.10	
Transportation tax.....				.72	
Total trucking charges.....				24.82	
Yardage.....				5.78	
Corn, 3½ bushels.....				5.60	
Transportation insurance.....				3.06	
National livestock and meat board fund.....				.12	
Inspection.....				.30	
Reserved for operating expenses or commission.....				8.05	
					47.73
Net proceeds.....					1,125.24

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to this invoice because in the past 2 or 3 days, during the debate on the O. P. A. measure, several Senators took the floor and contended that the Price Control Act had been administered fairly and honestly throughout the country. The invoice shows that on May 15 one of our farmers sent 34 hogs to market. Eighteen hogs weighed 4,595 pounds, and brought \$13.45 a hundred, which is 5 cents under the support price in Omaha. We cannot complain very much about that, but in the same shipment there were 16 hogs which brought only \$11 a hundred, the reason being that they were a trifle over the support weight. There

is a difference of \$2.45 a hundred on hogs for which the support price was not paid to the farmer who is entitled to that price. What I desire to point out to the Members of the Senate is that the processors are receiving the subsidy on all the hogs, whether they weigh 270 pounds, 450 pounds, or 180 pounds. Is that a fair administration of the Price Control Act? The letter, which is self-explanatory, explains that the case recited is not something that has happened to this farmer only, but it happens to thousands of farmers who have been guaranteed the support price, and the support-price provision is rendered inoperative.

Because of the large purchases of heavy hogs and lightweight hogs by the packers, the supplies of hogs within the support-price weights have accumulated in the markets until they are literally swamped and embargoes against shipments have been imposed in many markets.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that 30,000 hogs were carried over from last night to this morning in the markets of the country because there was no way for them to be sold.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas, and I want to say to him that this is not the only time when such a thing has occurred. The Senator will remember that within the past few days 76,000 hogs were held over.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska mentioned the larger figure, because the hold-overs have at times reached as high a figure as the Senator from Nebraska has just mentioned. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the farmer is not receiving the support price.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REED. The packers go into the market and buy overweight hogs and underweight hogs at a discount ranging as high as \$4 a hundred pounds.

The packers do not buy the support-price hogs until the supply of cheaper hogs, both the overweights and the underweights, is exhausted. That means that the support-price hogs are being held over in the markets every day, and in 2 or 3 days what was a Good and Choice hog to begin with, for which the farmer was entitled to the support price, becomes a Medium hog subject to discount of as much as \$2 a hundred pounds. This is the most outrageous thing I have encountered in my experience. This autocratic, bureaucratic policy established and carried out by these agencies, has given the hog farmers the most savage beating that any class of farmers ever received.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his statement. I hoped that while he was on his feet he would say that it is not only a fact that support-price hogs are not being purchased, and are being held over, but, in addition, there is a tremendous shrinkage on the held-over hogs. So even if the packers

finally pay the support price, in reality they are discounting such hogs.

Mr. REED. That is an entirely correct statement. That is the experience of the hog farmers in the Midwest.

Mr. WHERRY. On some occasions, as many as 76,000 hogs were held over because of inability to absorb the offerings of hogs, most of which consisted of support-price hogs. Wherever these conditions prevailed considerable shrinkage in weight naturally occurred, with resulting losses to the farmers.

At the same time, the packers received subsidy payments on pork based upon the total slaughter of hogs, regardless of the size of the hogs purchased. Thus, they were able to buy lightweight and heavy-weight hogs at a large discount, and, in addition, secured a discount on the support-price hogs through the additional shrinkage which occurred as a result of these market gluts, while at the same time the ceiling price on pork continued unchanged, and they received the same amount of subsidy.

So much for hogs. With respect to conditions in the cattle industry, a man who is high in the meat industry, and who is at present in one of the departments in Washington, said to me personally within the past 10 days that the cattle situation is more confused than it has been at any time in the past 5 years. That was his statement to me. He has been connected with the meat industry for years. He is in one of the departments, doing his level best to help out the marketing situation. He says that the cattle situation is more confused than it has been at any time in the past 5 years. He states that we are headed for a time when, unless something is done now, we can expect wholesale liquidation and a glutted market in cattle. That particular condition will be upon us unless something is done, and what has happened in the hog market will be experienced in the cattle market. Cattle will be shipped to market and subsidies will be paid to processors which will not go to producers. We cannot afford to let happen to the cattle industry what has happened to the hog producers.

The War Food Administration and the O. P. A. regulations have penalized the feeding of livestock by not allowing an adequate margin to cover the cost of feeding cattle in the feed lots.

Livestock producers have repeatedly protested bitterly against this situation and appealed to Government officials to correct it, but without success.

The group of Senators to whom I have referred has held meeting after meeting. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has attended some of those meetings, and he knows full well of the work. A nonpartisan group has tried to alleviate this condition. Last year, however, most of the cattle feeders took the risk anyway. They wanted to be patriotic, and they attempted to carry on their operations, although in many instances on a reduced scale because of the risk of heavy losses involved.

Today liquidation of cattle herds in the feed lots of the Nation is already under way at an unusually high rate. A report of the Bureau of Agricultural

Economics within the past 10 days showed that there were 23 percent less cattle in the Corn Belt feed lots than a year ago, and the lowest number in the past 6 years. I have just received a report from the State secretary of agriculture of Nebraska which states that there are 32 percent less cattle on feed in Nebraska feed lots than there were a year ago, in June 1943.

Many feeders have completely emptied their feed lots, and they will not be refilled because it is impossible for the feeders even to cover their costs of feeding cattle, due to the inadequate margin allowed in the ceilings, on the better grades of beef.

The feed situation is likewise in a deplorable state, due to governmental regulation. The Government deliberately embarked on a policy of low-priced, subsidized feed in order to stimulate increased production of livestock and poultry. It has steadfastly refused to allow an adequate price to grain producers to maintain adequate supplies of grain.

As a result of the maladjustment in grain and livestock prices, our enormous reserves of feed supplies were quickly liquidated, and we now face an acute shortage of feed, while at the same time there has been brought about an oversupply of cattle, hogs, poultry, and eggs. This has seriously hindered poultry producers and dairymen in obtaining needed supplies of corn.

Surplus supplies of corn were dammed up on the farms because of the inequitable price ceilings on corn, which held the market price of corn far below its value when fed to livestock. Instead of applying the obvious and sensible method of relief, namely, to increase the ceiling price on corn in line with its feeding value, so that farmers could afford to sell their surplus corn and maintain a high level of production, the Government added to the confusion and chaos by imposing the corn-freeze order which was applied to 125 counties producing the major part of the surplus corn of the country. Those are the counties where cattle feeding is done. Farmers in those areas were forbidden to sell their surplus corn to producers outside the areas, or even to sell corn to their neighbors needing it, except by cumbersome red tape procedures involving the necessity of securing a special permit through a special county board, and the livestock feeder is at a further disadvantage of 5 cents per bushel over industry in the purchase of corn.

This situation has resulted in a further liquidation of livestock, adding further to the glutting of markets and price demoralization, all at the expense of the producer.

Not only did the corn-freeze order provide that the Triple A should actually regulate what stock should be fed in feed lots, both hogs and cattle, but it went further; it discriminated against the cattle feeder to the extent of 5 cents a bushel as compared with industry in obtaining a supply of corn. If I wish to feed cattle, even though I obtain a permit, I must compete with the Government buying corn under the freeze order, at a disadvantage of 5 cents a bushel.

This situation has resulted in further liquidation of livestock, all at the expense of whom? At the expense of the producer of livestock.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska will cover this subject later, but I am sure he realizes that today a farmer having hogs weighing less than 180 pounds or more than 270 pounds cannot buy corn legally.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REED. What is the farmer to do? He cannot buy corn to feed his underweight or overweight hogs. The market will not absorb them. What is he to do? Is he to let them starve?

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the things which we would like to have the special committee consider. The Senator from Kansas has stated the situation exactly. The farmer cannot obtain a certificate from the Triple A to feed his out-of-class hogs. He cannot get corn. He is forced to sell his livestock in a demoralized market. The market for that kind of hogs has gone down as much as \$4 a hundred. That is what the producer is getting out of feeding livestock in the feed lots.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator intend to deal with the question of the duration of the corn-freeze order?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to make a statement on that subject?

Mr. REED. At the last conference which a group of Senators from the Middle West had, Mr. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, told us that the War Food Administration, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, was trying to buy 80,000,000 bushels of corn for industrial purposes, some for wet processors, some for dry processors, and some for munitions of various kinds. That was about a month ago. At that time he stated that 45,000,000 bushels were under contract, and he hoped to be able to raise the corn-freeze order in a few days.

From week to week I have kept in touch with the progress being made. During a period of 25 days from a date in May until a recent date in June, June 12, as I recall, the Commodity Credit Corporation had increased the corn under contract from 49 million bushels to 52 million bushels, an increase of 3,000,000 bushels in 25 days. At that rate the corn-freeze order will remain on corn until the next crop comes in.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REED. The present policy being enforced by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration is the most absurd thing I have ever heard of.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks explaining the effect of the corn-freeze order. I did not intend to cover that matter in my remarks at this time, because I am simply speaking in support of a resolution which I shall submit at the close of my statement. I hope it will receive the unanimous support of the Members of the Senate, and that it

will lead to an investigation of all the difficulties of the producers, the marketing situation, and the Government agencies involved, in an attempt to determine whether there cannot be devised a program which will insure to the producer the price which was intended for him under the Price Stabilization Act; insure the processor a satisfactory price for processing the meats, and enable meats to be sold over the counters into the hands of the consumers. That is the best way to control inflation, and is far better than any anti-inflation legislation we could put on the statute books.

The poultry and egg producers have taken a heavy beating as a result of the bungling of the egg price-support program. Patriotically responding to the Government's appeal to greatly expand the production of eggs, farmers produced record supplies of eggs, only to find that the Government was not prepared to make good on its price guarantee. Some Senators remember that. I know the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] remembers it, because he took a great interest in representing that group and helping it obtain the support price at 26 cents a dozen on the farm level, when they were guaranteed 34 cents a dozen at the farm level. The Government waited until the bottom dropped out of egg prices before it even attempted to formulate and issue the support prices which it would attempt to maintain in different markets of the country.

Is it not a sad thing that today there are 1,400 carloads of eggs standing on the railroad sidings, although people all over the world are hungry for eggs? Those eggs will be sold for \$30 a carload.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, we pay 55 cents a dozen for eggs in Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; as the senior Senator from Minnesota just said, if all Senators did not hear him, we pay 55 cents a dozen for eggs in Washington, D. C.

The support price as originally announced was an average annual farm price. Obviously, neither farmers nor dealers knew what the Government support price was at specific market until the market differentials were formulated and announced. The various Senators who insisted that the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration make good their promise to support the market differentials have every right and reason to protest.

After a costly delay, the market differentials were finally announced. Then the Government discovered it had not arranged for adequate facilities to receive, handle, and dispose of the necessary purchases. Such facilities were required in order to support those prices.

Several additional weeks of costly delay ensued while arrangements were being worked out. In some areas the price of eggs dropped within a short time from more than 40 cents a dozen to less than 20 cents a dozen at the farm, although the Government had promised to support prices to farmers at an average of 34 cents a dozen.

As a result of the failure of the Government adequately to maintain its

price-support guaranty to farmers, a drastic liquidation is taking place in the poultry industry.

The situation growing out of all these developments is an exceedingly grave one. It is a matter of serious concern to the entire Nation. Adequate steps must be taken immediately to prevent wholesale liquidation of cattle, hogs, and poultry on an unprecedented scale which might result in a national catastrophe. Mark my words, Mr. President, we are headed in that direction, unless something is done to alleviate the present marketing conditions, so that the prices paid will be comparable to the support prices which have been guaranteed to producers all the way along the line.

Dairy farmers likewise have suffered greatly as a result of the maladministration of price-control policies. Great numbers of dairymen live near urban and industrial centers where labor costs have skyrocketed. Feed costs and other expenses have likewise soared.

Urgent pleas of dairymen to the Office of Price Administration for increases in milk prices to offset these costs were rejected in most cases.

I can remember that less than 4 months ago, in the hearing room of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 24 Senators voted that the War Food Administration should increase the price of milk by whatever amount was necessary in those areas, in order that the necessary production might be obtained and in order that the producers might receive their cost of production. But the War Food Administration failed to take recognition of that action.

In many instances, State milk-control boards, established under State laws to regulate milk prices, found after thorough investigations that dairy farmers were losing at least 2 cents a quart, and in some cases more than that. Those boards ordered increases in milk prices to offset the losses and to maintain an adequate milk supply, only to find their efforts checked by the Office of Price Administration, which asserted that its powers were superior to State laws and regulations in that field.

Meanwhile, dairy farmers unable to get adequate relief were forced to liquidate their dairy herds in rapidly increasing numbers. I have seen dairy cows sold in the market places for beef, although they should have been kept on the farms in order to produce the milk needed by the American people.

As the situation grew worse, the Office of Price Administration in collaboration with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the War Food Administration, embarked on a program of subsidies, in lieu of necessary price adjustments on milk and its products. This subsidy program is not proving satisfactory. Many dairymen still are being squeezed until they are either liquidating their herds or reducing their operations.

Dairymen resent the red tape and regimentation involved in the subsidy program. There is serious question whether milk production can be maintained at adequate levels to meet wartime demands, unless the situation is corrected.

Much of this confusion is believed to result from the division of authority and responsibility which exists in the various governmental agencies dealing with the production, marketing, processing, rationing, and control of prices of food. There has been an almost total lack of correlation between the agencies having to do with those matters. The division of responsibility results in conflicting policies, statements, and actions, costly delays in the determination of policies, and confusion among the producers, processors, distributors, and the public generally.

A large number of Senators, because of the gravity of this situation in its many phases, have interested themselves in this problem which confronts American agriculture. It is believed that the problem has been permitted to develop to such an extent that it demands early and immediate action.

It is felt that all phases of this unfortunate situation should be completely and thoroughly investigated by the Senate. With that thought in view, I am submitting for myself and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] a resolution directing the Vice President to appoint a special bipartisan committee of Senators to study all phases of the problems confronting the producers, packers, and distributors of these vital agricultural and food supplies, and to formulate specific recommendations to deal with existing conditions.

Mr. President, I may say that Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has sent me a letter in which he approves of the proposed investigation. I ask unanimous consent that his letter may be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1944.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: At the meeting of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation on May 31, 1944, a seven-point program was adopted to alleviate the major difficulties which farmers and livestock producers have experienced in recent

months. This program was developed by the National Livestock Committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am attaching a copy of this program.

Included in this program was the following recommendation:

"3. If it becomes necessary, request a congressional investigation of the practices of purchasers of livestock for slaughter in order to correct the many abuses which are now said to be prevalent."

Pursuant to this recommendation, I wish to respectfully urge that an investigation be instituted immediately by Congress of the manner in which packers are taking advantage of the situation in hogs, cattle, and other livestock in circumventing the spirit and purpose of floors, ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the American farmer and the National Treasury.

Sincerely yours,
EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

In submitting the resolution, which bears the names of the Senators I have mentioned I wish to add that I have been unable to see many Senators who might wish their names added to the resolution as cointroducers. The resolution has not yet been printed. I am now sending it to the desk. If there are any other Senators who wish their names added as cointroducers, I shall be happy to have them put their names on the resolution.

Mr. President, the situation confronting the livestock producers, the processors, the wholesalers, the distributors, the retailers, and consumers in the country is a serious one, and needs a thorough investigation, an investigation which will be constructive, and an investigation which will alleviate existing conditions.

I send the resolution to the desk, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 309) submitted by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. REED, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. BALL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining—

(1) the conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, feed, poultry, eggs, milk, and the products thereof;

(2) the effects of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) any practices wherein processors and distributors of such commodities are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(4) reasons for the failures to support prices to producers as required by existing law;

(5) alleged adverse effects of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly the extent to which livestock feeders have been penalized because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock;

(6) alleged adverse effects upon the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries of the price and other policies relative to corn and other feed grains and the maladjustments resulting therefrom;

(7) procedures followed by the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and other Government agencies in the issuance of regulations, orders, and directives relating to maximum prices, rationing, production, processing, and marketing of agricultural commodities and products thereof and the extent to which conflicts of policies and recommendations have occurred; and

(8) improvements in conditions which could be effected through consolidation of all activities pertaining to food production, marketing, processing, distribution, rationing, and price control, under one agency.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter received by me from the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, setting forth his position relative to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Realizing the tremendous responsibility which rests upon Secretary Jones' shoulders for the welfare of our national economy, I felt that his opinion on this subject would be of great value. I wrote to him last Monday, requesting his opinion.

His letter to me reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 30, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 19, 1944, and a copy of S. 1385, which you introduced in the Senate, to provide for the approval of the agreement between Canada and the United States of March 18, 1941, and to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Based upon the extensive studies that the Department of Commerce has made, the Department has always supported this project and I personally feel,

as you do, that this undertaking will greatly strengthen our national economy.

You will recall that I appeared before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941, giving my full support to the project as a national defense undertaking. I am equally convinced that it is an invaluable asset in any program of post-war production and commerce. I am sure that the approval of S. 1385 at this time is highly desirable so that we shall be ready to move ahead with construction as soon as conditions permit.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, Secretary of Commerce Jones enclosed with his letter a copy of a letter which he wrote to Chairman MANSFIELD of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, dated June 23, 1941. I shall not read the letter at this time, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 23, 1941.

DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I have your letter of June 3, enclosing H. R. 4927, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, and stating that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would like to have an expression of the views of the Department of Commerce relative to the advisability of enacting this measure into law.

At the request of the President, the Department of Commerce has been engaged for over a year in an extensive study of the St. Lawrence navigation and power project. The findings of this survey have been issued from time to time. In conducting this investigation the Department has had the cooperation of many agencies of the Government—among others, the United States Maritime Commission, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the War Department, the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor. The survey has considered the navigational aspects, the economic and commercial phases, the shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes, and the relationship of industrial development to low-cost electric power.

As a result of these studies, the experts of the Department of Commerce have found that extensive commercial navigation through the proposed St. Lawrence route is wholly feasible. The only serious limitation upon free navigation over this channel is the closed season during the winter months, but this condition is no different from that existing in the Great Lakes and the port of Montreal. There is, of course, extensive utilization of the excellent port facilities in these areas.

Studies of the Department show that the canal would reduce transportation costs to the Atlantic Ocean of certain agricultural and other commodities for a substantial section of the country.

The Department's investigation of shipbuilding facilities in the Great Lakes area, which the canal would make accessible to the open seas, shows that there are extensive shipyards, some of which are equipped to construct oceangoing vessels, and even some naval vessels of the cruiser class. These facilities could, with the canal, be utilized in building oceangoing ships, and have the advantage of being far inland.

The survey of the power requirements in the New York State area indicates that the power is needed and would in any event soon

be absorbed in the industrial progress of this region. Power to meet defense needs at this time and for any possible recurring emergency is vital.

As a means of commercial intercourse, just as the Panama Canal linked the east and west coasts, the St. Lawrence route would link the Middle West with the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the west coasts.

This enterprise should be considered in relation to its importance to the Nation as a whole, just as power dams and other waterways have been considered. We develop and maintain inland waterways and intercoastal canals. We provide navigation on the Hudson, Potomac, Delaware, James, Savannah, Warrior, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, Monongahela, Kanawha, Cumberland, San Joaquin, Columbia, and Willamette Rivers, all for the benefit of agriculture and commerce. While each of these is of importance to its particular locality, they are also important to the Nation as a whole.

One development with which I am especially familiar is the Houston Ship Channel, which has been of inestimable benefit to agriculture and industry in the Middle West and Southwest, bringing the sea 50 miles inland, and providing another rail and water connection for intercoastal and foreign shipping.

We cannot have too many inland waterways, both in the interests of agriculture, trade and industry, and for national defense. The value of the St. Lawrence project as a defense measure cannot be too strongly stressed, and I am not thinking just of the immediate emergency, although that is vital. Regrettable as the thought of war is, recent developments make it imperative that we be prepared to meet it on any basis at any time. And no time should be lost.

It is the Department's conclusion, therefore, that the project should be undertaken. If thought advisable, it could easily be financed through the issuance and sale of revenue bonds payable from toll charges and the sale of power, with no cost to the taxpayers.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

FOREIGN PETROLEUM CONTRACTS— STATEMENT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the release issued yesterday by the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Committee on Petroleum Resources has received satisfactory assurances that no contracts on foreign petroleum matters, such as the proposed trans-Arabian pipe line, will be made by the Petroleum Reserves Corporation without timely notice to the committee. Accordingly, the committee yesterday voted unanimously to defer public hearings pending the further conferences on petroleum between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom.

The decision to postpone public hearings was reached after consultation with representatives of all of the executive departments concerned.

The committee will continue its studies relating to recommendations for a national petroleum policy and has been assured that

it will be kept fully advised by the executive departments on developments in foreign oil matters.

THE POLISH PRIME MINISTER

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we have been recently honored by a visit to the United States and to the Capital at Washington by the Polish Prime Minister. I wish to say that he has made a very favorable impression on us all. He is an energetic, young, and capable spokesman of a brave people. The comment of the press has been highly complimentary. I hope that he will be successful in his efforts to bring about a satisfactory settlement of his nation's problems.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "The Polish Prime Minister," from the New York Times of June 11, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Russia and Poland" from the Washington Star of June 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1944]

THE POLISH PRIME MINISTER

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-exile, has arrived in Washington at President Roosevelt's invitation, with the knowledge of the British and Russian Governments. He is welcome, not only as the representative of his country, but because much of his career is what we have almost come to believe peculiarly American. He was born in Westphalia, whither his father had gone to work in a coal mine. He went back to his native Province as a boy, where later he studied in an agricultural college and a folk university. At 16 he went to work in a sugar refinery. So early he became active in societies of Polish young men declaring for a rising against Germany. At 18 he was fighting the Germans.

He showed a strong talent for organization in local and county affairs and especially in the right wing of the Peasant Party. He became one of its deputy leaders and a member of Parliament. In the Polish National Council, formed to take the place of that parliament, he was Paderewski's deputy vice chairman. After his chief's death he succeeded to that office, the Council having moved to London. In 1941 he became Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Interior in Sikorski's cabinet. Upon General Sikorski's death he took his present post. His relations with the Polish underground have been of the closest.

His cabinet is a coalition of representatives of the Peasant Party, Socialists, Christian Democrats, Nationalists and three members with no political labels. Since there has long been more or less harsh talk about the Polish "oligarchs," it may be instructive to look at Mr. Mikolajczyk's cabinet. Two members are small farmers, two labor men, three newspapermen. There is one lawyer, one soldier, one diplomat. The lawyer used to be counsel for labor unions. Of the three newspaper members one is a Catholic priest who has been a worker for the underground, one is a son of an unskilled laborer, one a son of a small storekeeper. These biographies will compare well with those of Congressmen in the Congressional Directory. Without any question of politics or policies Americans can see in the visiting Prime Minister a practicing Democrat. And he isn't one of those "wicked old men"; he will be 43 in July.

[From the Washington Star of June 6, 1944]

RUSSIA AND POLAND

The Polish Premier's arrival in Washington to talk with President Roosevelt at this particular time suggests the heartening possibility that the gulf between Moscow and the Government-in-exile in London may yet be bridged, or at least that some temporary understanding may be reached to hold differences in abeyance until the common enemy is driven from Poland.

It seems improbable, at any rate, that the President would have invited Premier Mikolajczyk to come here, or that the latter would have taken the trip, unless both had some reason to believe that by an exchange of views they could improve the present unfortunate situation. In his last address to the House of Commons, Prime Minister Churchill said it was his impression that things are not so bad as they may appear on the surface between Russia and Poland, and Mr. Mikolajczyk's visit—a diplomatic development of first importance—certainly tends to add weight to this cautious optimism.

The Russo-Polish dispute is not something that lends itself to any easy, off-the-cuff judgments. It involves, in the first place, the question of where Poland's eastern boundary should be—a territorial problem full of many complex historical and ethnographical factors. And in the second place, it involves the make-up of the present government in exile. Moscow has repeatedly charged that that government contains certain elements so hostile to the Soviet Union that friendly diplomatic relations are not possible. Many prominent Poles, on the other hand, in addition to objecting to Russia's territorial claims, have voiced the fear that Premier Stalin is seeking to establish a subservient Polish regime.

Up to now the Russians and Poles have obviously been wanting in mutual trust and confidence, but serious and deep as their differences may be, it would be sheer political defeatism to assume that an honest and just settlement between them—with or without the government in exile, as now constituted—is impossible. We must assume otherwise. We must assume that by a fair give and take on each side, both parties should be able to arrive at a working agreement. If we cannot assume this, then the outlook for a sound European peace is not very encouraging. For Poland it is a test case, and upon the way in which it is handled depends not only such immediate military matters as the Polish underground's cooperation with the Red Army but also the all-important, long-term task of equitably relating small powers to big in a genuine system of collective security.

The British Government has spent months trying, without success, to mediate this dispute, and Moscow sometime ago politely rejected Washington's tender of good offices in it. Nevertheless, as Mr. Churchill has intimated and as the projected talks between President Roosevelt and the Polish Premier seem to indicate, the door still is not completely shut to a settlement. At least we must hope so, for no political event could better strengthen the cause of the United Nations than a mutually satisfactory understanding between Poland and its great and powerful neighbor.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. DANAHY, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 35, 57, and 65 to the bill and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 64 and 66 to the bill.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4899, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. Is the Senator in position to make a statement with reference to the present status of appropriation bills; that is, what bills have not reached the Appropriations Committee, and what bills have passed both Houses of Congress and are still in conference, in order that we may have an over-all picture of the mass of work which confronts us before taking a recess or an adjournment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

As every Senator knows, there are 14 great appropriation bills. Two, only

have become law. Twelve of them still remain to be enacted into law. The first bill not finally passed is the independent offices bill for 1945. The last conference report concerning that bill was completed yesterday, and it was agreed to by the House this morning. It will be presented to the Senate, I hope, within a few minutes. I have been assured that it will be presented today. I shall ask unanimous consent to have it agreed to by the Senate. That will make a third bill disposed of.

The Navy appropriation bill has reached its final stage in the House, and the report has been made to the Senate. As soon as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] comes into the Chamber, I shall ask him to call up the conference report, and when it has been disposed of four bills out of the total number of 14 will be out of the way.

There are several other bills remaining to be disposed of. The war civil functions bill has passed both bodies of Congress and has been sent to conference. We hope to have it out of the way within a day or two.

The State, Justice, and Commerce bill is in slightly better condition, and we hope to have it disposed of and sent to the President for his signature by tomorrow.

The legislative and judiciary bill is still in conference and we hope to dispose of it within a day or two. The conference report was adopted in the House yesterday, but there are some amendments remaining which are still in controversy, and they may take 2 or 3 days to dispose of. I hope it will not take so long, but it may take that long.

The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is in conference.

The Interior Department bill is in conference, but the conferees have not as yet met. It will take possibly several days before that bill can be disposed of.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill is next to the furthest behind. That is because of the illness of the chairman of the subcommittee, but he is now very busily engaged in putting the bill in shape so that it may be reported to the Senate today if possible. I hope very much that it may be reported this week. That bill, however, is considerably behind.

The war agencies bill has been reported to the Senate, and will be taken up either today or tomorrow.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REED. May I inquire if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is aware that the political party to which Members on this side of the aisle belong is to hold a convention in Chicago beginning the week of June 26? What suggestions has the Senator from Tennessee to make as to how we are going to have all this business completed in time to enable us to perform our duties to the public and to the party?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to say to the Senator and to the Senate

that as the Senator knows, the Appropriations Committee is doing everything humanly possible to have the necessary appropriation bills passed. I may say to the Senator that yesterday I agreed to some amendments to which I was thoroughly opposed, and I did so largely because I hoped we could finish all the appropriation bills in time for Senators on the other side of the aisle to attend the Republican Convention. I think we should be able to have these bills passed unless something happens to prevent their prompt passage.

As I have said, the District of Columbia appropriation bill is behind. The war agencies bill will be taken up not later than tomorrow, under any circumstances, and possibly this afternoon.

Mr. REED. I can add my testimony to that of the Senator from Tennessee that the Appropriations Committee is diligent in its efforts to prepare the appropriation bills and have them acted upon by the Senate. I happen to be a member of that committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are doing everything humanly possible to have the bills reported and acted upon.

I wish to say that the Labor and Federal Security Agency bill is now before the Senate, and will pass today. I think that will be easily taken care of.

The Military Establishment bill, which is the largest of all the appropriation bills, is in the process of being acted upon in the other House at this time. Whether they will pass it and send it over to the Senate today or tomorrow, I do not know, for it is an enormous bill, and there is much work to be done in connection with it. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who has charge of that bill, will have it taken up immediately when it is ready for consideration, and it will be acted upon just as soon as possible. There is, however, a world of work about that bill.

It is going to take the efforts not only of all Senators who are members of the Appropriations Committee but of all other Senators who are interested, in order to have all the appropriation bills passed by Saturday week. As we all know, it is necessary to pass them by that time, in order that the Republican Senators may attend the convention of their party. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I shall do everything within my power to facilitate the passage of the appropriation bills, and have already done so, as I think the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Maine both will testify.

The lend-lease appropriation bill has been passed, as we know, and is now in the other House. I see no particular reason why there should be a hold-up on any of these bills, and, so, unless something unforeseen happens, we can get through by Saturday a week. But the Senate will have to be exceedingly active to get them through by that time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Something besides the appropriation bills is necessary

in order for the Congress to put itself in a justifiable position to take a recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true, but the ones I have mentioned are the principal things.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so. I believe the principal thing is essential reconversion legislation in respect to the period following the termination of hostilities; and I think it would be insufferable for Congress to consent to anything more than a purely temporary recess until such time as it has put reconversion legislation on the statute books. The entire economic life of America in the post-war era depends on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the proposed legislation referred to by the Senator from Michigan is exceedingly important. All I can say to the Senator is that my duties on the Appropriations Committee have been such that I have not had time to give it the attention which I should have given it and which I expect to give it when it comes before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator, so far as he is personally concerned, has made a magnificent contribution, as usual. He is one of the most indefatigable Members of the Senate. I rose not to suggest that he had failed in any aspect of his duty, because he never does, but I did not want the inference to stand that the only thing in the way of a recess is the appropriation bills. That very definitely is not so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say that I shall be glad to help in every way I can with respect to the measure which he regards as so important, which I regard as so important, and which, I think, all Senators regard as so important.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the suggestions and observations of the Senator from Michigan. I think it would be nothing short of a tragedy if the Congress should adjourn or take a recess without putting back of it reconversion legislation and all other matters that go with it. We are moving fast, but all essential legislation should be passed before Congress takes a vacation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to refer the Senator to the leaders, but, so far as I know, there is no such plan. The only plan, so far as I am aware, is to adjourn for a time on account of the conventions that are to be held. Whether we are to adjourn for 30 days, I cannot say; I have not discussed it with anyone, I do not know as to that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated the situation precisely as it is and as it is recognized to be by Members on this side. I think it might as well be understood one time as another that any cooperation on this side in behalf of a recess is contingent upon the passage of the

O. P. A. legislation, of reconversion legislation, and of the necessary appropriation bills. I think until those results are consummated that there will be no favor shown to a recess on this side of the aisle. I am sure the Senator from Michigan will confirm that understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree to that. I think it is essential that there should be recesses for the Republican National Convention and the Democratic National Convention, as such proceedings are an indispensable part of the process of government in the United States, but beyond those temporary respites I know of no justification whatever for any sort of a recess until the sine qua non bills are passed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I feel very much the same way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 4, line 15, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$169,200," and insert "\$213,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics," on page 6, line 4, after the word "Bureau", to strike out "\$1,212,300," and insert "\$1,312,300," and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,140,000," and insert "\$1,160,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 7, after the word "laws", to strike out "\$1,510,400" and insert "\$1,556,185."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 7, line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$367,900" and insert "\$376,600", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$328,000" and insert "\$329,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$260,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 5, to insert:

Salaries and expenses (national defense): For expenses necessary in carrying out, in connection with the national defense, provisions of laws imposing duties and responsibilities on the Children's Bureau, including objects specified in appropriations for the Children's Bureau under this title, and other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations under the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, \$25,548.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 21, after the name "United States", to insert "and of Army aviation cadets", and on page 10, line 1, before the words "per centum", to strike out "2" and insert "3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Women's Bureau", on page 12, after line 9, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau (national defense): For expenses necessary in carrying out, in connection with national defense activities, the provisions of the act creating the Women's Bureau (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations under the Department of Labor for contingent expenses and travel, \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Howard University", on page 17, line 20, after the word "funds", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$751,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Education—Education and training, defense workers (national defense)", on page 23, after line 21, to insert:

Visual aids for war training (national defense): For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in procuring and making available, for reproduction and use, visual-aid instructional units, consisting of motion-picture films, lantern slides, slide films, and film loops, for training in occupations essential to the war effort (each such occupation to be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses; printing and binding; \$207,312: *Provided*, That copies of slides and films shall be sold at a price sufficient to pay the whole cost of production of such slides and films.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Health Service", on page 29, line 6, after the name "Public Health Service", to strike out "\$11,450,000" and insert "\$11,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital", on page 38, line 14, after the word "hospital", to strike out the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1945 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the Superintendent upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned," and insert "*Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1945 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the Superintendent upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, such amounts as shall be calculated by the Superintendent to be due for such care on the basis of a per diem rate recommended annually in advance

by the Federal Board of Hospitalization and approved by the President and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments of such bills paid for in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 4, to insert:

For an additional amount for building for storeroom, etc., St. Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, including the objects specified under the appropriation for this purpose in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, \$445,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator", on page 46, after line 2, to insert:

National Youth Administration liquidation: Not to exceed \$78,000 of the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the National Youth Administration in the War Manpower Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, and the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, are hereby continued available until June 30, 1945, for all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Security Administrator to liquidate the affairs of the National Youth Administration, including settlement of claims for property damage accruing prior to January 2, 1944, under paragraph 20 of the National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1943; payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave to employees who have not liquidated such by June 30, 1944; payment of salaries and other necessary administrative expenses (including personal services in the District of Columbia and travel expenses), not exceeding \$53,000, incurred during the fiscal year 1945; and payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave of the personnel employed under such amount: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed under such sum of \$53,000 at a rate exceeding the rates applicable to classification grade CAF 13 or the equivalent and the amount allocated for salaries thereunder shall not exceed \$36,500 and the amount for microfilming records shall not exceed \$25,000: *Provided further*, That the Federal Security Administrator is hereby authorized to retain such office materials, supplies, and equipment of the National Youth Administration as may be necessary in carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, and such office materials, supplies, and equipment shall not be subject to the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, with respect to such property, during the period of such use: *Provided further*, That said Administrator is authorized to appoint such personnel as may be required for the purposes hereof without regard to civil service and classification laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 6, after the name "United States", to strike out "\$1,350,000" and insert "\$1,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board", on page 55, line 15, after the word "law", to strike out "\$2,000,450" and insert "\$2,125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 22, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "\$478,000" and insert "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 14, after the word "filed" to strike out "by an employee or employees of such plant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—Executive Office of the President—Apprentice Training Service", on page 61, line 15, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$9,000"; in line 16, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$77,700", and in line 17, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$537,500" and insert "\$593,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$92,600" and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$637,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment which is in reality a committee amendment. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to offer an amendment, which has been printed and which lies on the desk of Senators, to insert a new paragraph beginning in line 6, page 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

Temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons: For expenses necessary to enable the Federal Security Administrator to provide temporary aid, not to extend beyond the duration of the existing war and 6 months thereafter, to enemy aliens and other persons excluded from areas designated pursuant to authority contained in Proclamations No. 2525 of December 7, 1941, and 2526 and 2527 of December 8, 1941, and Executive Order No. 9066 of February 19, 1942, or whose normal means of livelihood has been interrupted by reasons of restrictions imposed by the Attorney General or any law or order authorizing the removal of persons whose presence may be deemed dangerous to the United States, and to the dependents of any of such persons, \$50,000: *Provided*, That funds may be transferred with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to this appropriation from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority", in an amount not exceeding \$50,000, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation and the whole administered and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may make expenditures from this appropriation, by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as he may designate, expenditures by such other agencies to be without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this an amendment which the committee authorized to be offered?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator make a brief explanation of it?

Mr. REED. I shall be very happy to do so. The appropriation called for is a very modest sum and is desired by the Federal Security Agency to enable it to take care of indigent aliens who have been separated from the head of the family by some action of the Department of Justice. For example, there is an alien in this country, we will say, who has not as yet become a citizen. The F. B. I. may mark that man for observation. He may not have committed any crime, may not have done anything wrong, but he is an enemy alien, so the F. B. I. watches him. Frequently that interferes with that head of a family earning a living. The number of dependents of aliens of that character is small probably less than a hundred.

An arrangement has been made whereby all such cases are handled by one agency. The Federal Security Agency goes to the State or local relief authority and arranges with them to take care of the few cases of this kind. I asked in the committee, Why does not the local community or the State take care of them? The answer is obvious. In a number of States no one can obtain relief unless he is a citizen of the State, or has been in the State for a given length of time.

The appropriation called for is not very great. The object is very deserving. The committee discussed it at some length, and authorized and directed me to offer the amendment to the bill.

I inquire of the Senator from Maine whether I have made an adequate explanation.

Mr. WHITE. It is a surprisingly satisfactory one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 64, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

Migration of workers: To enable the War Manpower Commission to provide, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Chairman of said Commission for the temporary migration of workers from foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere (pursuant to agreements between the United States and such foreign countries), for employment in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the war effort, including the transportation of such workers from points outside the United States to ports of entry of the United States and return (including transportation from place of employment in the United States to port of entry of the United States in any case of default by an employer to provide such transportation to a worker, in which event the employer shall be liable to the United States for the cost thereof), cost of temporary maintenance of workers in reception centers in foreign countries and in the United States, when necessary, reasonable subsistence and emergency medical care of such workers from the time of reporting for transportation to the United States or return to the country of origin until arrival at

the destination, necessary assistance to meet emergency health and welfare problems while in the United States, when such assistance is not otherwise available to such persons, and guaranties of employment while in the United States to the extent agreed upon with the foreign country from which the workers are imported, \$2,465,000, of which not to exceed \$123,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses necessary for the foregoing, including not to exceed \$12,000 for temporary employment of administrative personnel outside continental United States, not to exceed \$1,000 for printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed \$25,800 for travel expenses: *Provided*, That no transportation of workers shall be allowed hereunder unless the employer and the worker have entered into a contract for employment approved by said Chairman or his designee, and unless said Chairman certifies that reasonably adequate use is being made of local labor supply: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall remain available after June 30, 1945, for the purpose of fulfilling guaranties and other obligations theretofore incurred with respect to such foreign workers and for all other purposes connected with the protection and ultimate return of any workers theretofore transported: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the recruitment or transportation of workers for employment in agriculture.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment is similar to provision made heretofore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, Department of Labor (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to liquidate during the fiscal year 1945 the existing organization of the Working Conditions Service, including payment of accumulated and accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of this Service; such travel as may be necessary to the accomplishment of the said liquidation; and the termination of existing leases for office space an indeterminate amount to be derived from the unexpended and unobligated balance of the appropriation made to the Division of Labor Standards (national defense) in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, approved December 23, 1943, not exceeding \$40,000.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the full committee denied the appropriation for a continuation of this agency. Therefore I am asking that the agency be liquidated, and that it be permitted to expend not to exceed \$40,000 of its unexpended present balance to enable it to liquidate, which means the termination of leases, paying for accrued vacations, and doing other things necessary to winding up the agency.

Mr. BRIDGES. The explanation is entirely satisfactory to me, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President are we about to act on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is rushing through a major bill pretty rapidly. There are several things which I should like to have explained before the bill is passed.

I wish to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill as to the provision for the Women's Bureau, on page 12. As I understand, the Women's Bureau asked for an amount somewhat in excess of \$200,000 to continue their work, which is rather important, having to do with women in industry. I am wondering how the decision to place the figure at \$55,000 was arrived at.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from the report of the committee:

In the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, there was made available for 6 months of the current fiscal year \$50,000 for the purpose of enabling the Bureau to make a study of the problems to be encountered during the transitional period, and a study of hours of work in relation to industrial fatigue of women workers. The Department requested \$110,000 to continue this work during the fiscal year 1945. The committee recommend \$55,000 for the purpose of concluding the studies that are now under way. In recommending this amount, it is the intention of the committee that no new studies shall be undertaken, and that the studies now in progress shall be completed during the fiscal year 1945 within the amount of appropriation proposed. The remaining \$90,000 requested under this appropriation for the purpose of providing technical staff assistance to conduct studies of jobs that women are performing in heavy industries has not been approved by the committee but has been disallowed in its entirety.

In other words, it is to carry on for a full year the work which has already been begun.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, it involves a liquidating program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bushfield	Eastland
Austin	Butler	Ellender
Ball	Byrd	Ferguson
Bankhead	Capper	George
Barkley	Chavez	Gerry
Bilbo	Connally	Gillette
Brewster	Cordon	Guffey
Bridges	Danaher	Gurney
Buck	Davis	Hatch
Burton	Downey	Hawkes

Hill	Murray	Truman
Holman	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Tydings
Kilgore	Pepper	Vandenberg
La Follette	Radcliffe	Wagner
Lucas	Reed	Wallgren
McClellan	Revercomb	Walsh, Mass.
McFarland	Reynolds	Walsh, N. J.
McKellar	Robertson	Weeks
Maloney	Russell	Wherry
Maybank	Shipstead	White
Mead	Stewart	Wiley
Millikin	Taft	Willis
Moore	Thomas, Idaho	
Murdoch	Thomas, Okla.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a communication from the chairman of our State industrial commission, Voyta Wrabetz, I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to turn to page 41 of the bill. In line 11 on page 41 it will be noticed that the amount proposed to be appropriated is \$25,000,000. The Social Security Board recommended \$34,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945, and the Bureau of the Budget approved a recommendation for \$31,000,000.

The letter from this distinguished citizen of Wisconsin so well presents the need throughout the Nation for at least \$31,000,000 that I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would accept an amendment in that amount and take it to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House agreed on \$25,000,000, and the Senate committee did likewise. The House thought it was sufficient, and the Senate committee thought it was sufficient. If it should prove to be insufficient, there would be no trouble about getting an additional appropriation in a deficiency bill. So the amount was left as the House had placed it. I think if the Senator will examine into the question, he will find that \$25,000,000 will be ample.

Mr. WILEY. I wish briefly to refer to several paragraphs in this letter, and after I shall have read portions of it I shall ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

The request is summarized as follows:

A restoration in the Senate of at least the \$31,000,000 figure originally estimated by the Social Security Board. We hold that this is hardly more than adequate to meet existing work loads, to say nothing of making even a minimum provision for future contingencies. In the event that this item is adjusted in the Senate, we solicit our Members in the House to communicate the position of the States to the Member of the House on the conference committee that will ultimately adjust the figure.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION,
Madison, June 13, 1944.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We would like to enlist your support in a problem confronting

the industrial commission in the administration of the Unemployment Compensation Act of this State. The problem at hand confronts all State unemployment-compensation agencies, and it is considered to be of such importance by them as to call for their concerted action with their respective congressional delegations.

The problem referred to is the item of the administrative grants to States for the administration of State unemployment-compensation laws for the 1944-45 fiscal year, contained in H. R. 4899.

Twenty-five million dollars was recommended for this purpose by the Appropriations Committee of the House, which sum was accepted by the House in the appropriation bill H. R. 4899. The bill has gone over to the Senate and will come before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The Social Security Board had recommended \$34,000,000 for fiscal 1945, and the Budget Bureau had approved \$31,000,000.

The \$25,000,000 figure would involve a crippling cut, not for the Federal agency but for the State agencies who receive these grants. Such a figure would cripple the administration of State unemployment-compensation laws in the very year when they will be of the greatest public importance.

The State unemployment-compensation agencies are definitely of the opinion that if this sum of money is made available to the Social Security Board for meeting the administrative costs of State unemployment-compensation operations for the ensuing fiscal year, without further provision for a contingent fund or without certain instructions to the Board guiding its disbursement, good probabilities exist that the functioning of the present State unemployment-compensation program will be so impaired as to discredit it.

Due to the Board's announced preference for a national system to supplant the existing State systems, the States feel that, out of fairness to the Board and to themselves, it would be improper to rely entirely upon the Board's representations and its presentation of the situation to Congress; and the States consequently feel that they have no recourse other than to directly call the attention of Congress to the matter in question.

For the fiscal year now coming to a close, Congress appropriated \$35,328,000 to meet the administrative expenses of State unemployment-compensation agencies. Of this appropriated sum, thirty-three and one-third million dollars was granted to the States, with the result that an unencumbered balance of approximately \$2,000,000 will lapse on June 30. During this fiscal year now closing, there is every reason to believe that the volume of unemployment-compensation claims has achieved a bedrock minimum. With the invasion of the Continent successfully under way in its initial stages, and considering the European theater of operations more generally, there is every good reason to believe that the ensuing fiscal year will bring a vast increase in the work load of State agencies. This is so because it is generally understood and agreed that, with the fall of Nazi Germany, there will be a marked cut-back in the production of war materials, with a resultant reconversion of a material percentage of our plant capacity for other uses. Charles Wilson of the War Production Board has recently estimated this anticipated cut-back as 35 percent. The cut-back, when it comes, can only mean that the States would be called upon to service a great volume of unemployment-compensation claimants, who will be idle during the reconversion and reallocation of manpower processes.

It is clear that if the States are to meet the impending impact of unemployment, they must begin now to prepare for it. Although much paper planning has been done, little actual preparation has been undertaken. The Social Security Board has felt constrained to hold the States within the

limits of their immediate work load—so much so that the approximately \$2,000,000 balance, above referred to, which sum could well have been spent in the purchase of supplies, forms, and equipment, which require considerable time for delivery, apparently will be allowed to lapse.

The Social Security Board, in preparing its budget for the ensuing fiscal year, concluded that approximately \$34,000,000 for the operation of State agencies would be sufficient. This is approximately comparable to the thirty-three and one-third million dollars that will have been used by the State agencies at the close of the present fiscal year. The Board is reluctant to enlighten the States on the basis of the formula used in arriving at its budget estimates, but, by reason of the close similarity of the approximately \$34,000,000 requested for the ensuing year to the thirty-three and one-third million dollars actually used this year, it can be fairly concluded that the estimated budget figure for the next year reflects only the current work loads of the State, with perhaps a minimum allowance for the advance preparation and the ultimate expansion that is necessary to meet the critical problems of the next year.

The \$34,000,000 estimated by the Board was reduced to \$31,000,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. The \$31,000,000 was, in turn, further reduced (and rather arbitrarily, and without reference to any definite criteria, as the record will show) to \$25,000,000 by the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. The reasoning, as contained in the committee report of the House group recommending the reduction demonstrates a sufficient basis for the concern of State agencies:

"The \$25,000,000 provided in the bill is a reduction of \$6,000,000 from the Budget estimate and a reduction of \$10,328,000 from the 1944 appropriation. Under this item of expense is performed the collection of contributions and the payment of benefits under unemployment compensation features of the social-security program. At this time the work in connection with the collection of contributions has increased due to the increased number of persons employed. On the other hand, the work in connection with the payment of benefits has decreased and in the opinion of the committee should decrease much more. It is reported that an average of approximately 100,000 persons are receiving unemployment benefits each week. There is little excuse for persons to be unemployed in this country today. The need for manpower is greater now than ever before and any general unemployment is inexcusable and should not be encouraged by the payment of unemployment benefits."

The record is void of any efforts on the part of anyone to straighten out the above faulty comprehension.¹

One can infer from the above-cited excerpt that the committee supposed that the appropriations recommended by it were to be directly used in the making of benefit payments. Thus, it was reasoned that there was no excuse for the payment of benefits at this time; therefore, sums would not be made available for making such payments.

The clear basic fact is that if it is desired to hold benefit payments to a minimum at this time—and, of course, this is desirable—more money, not less money, is necessary for

administrative purposes. Persons claiming unemployment compensation under State laws are prima facie entitled thereto, and it is up to the administrative agencies to rebut the prima facie showing by investigating the claimants' status. Any material cut in appropriations that would make necessary further reductions in our field office and investigating staff might well mean a great expansion in benefit payments.

Although reference is made in the committee reports to functions performed by the State agencies other than benefit payments, sufficient recognition was not given to these other functions. The problem of contribution collection is now greatly magnified by reason of increased payrolls and the type and nature of many employers in the field of war production. The processing of wage records relating to greatly increased numbers of covered employers, which is a necessary prerequisite to the payment of future benefits, is also of greatly increased proportions. Also, to meet even our minimum benefit-payment load, it is necessary to maintain at least a skeleton staff in our field offices.

The question may be asked: "Why should the States concern themselves at this time with the appropriation figure in H. R. 4899? Why not spend it so as to meet efficiently their present operating load and to make reasonable advance preparation for the rather definitely foreseeable crisis ahead? In the event that the amount proves insufficient, then Congress will make a deficiency appropriation."

If a solution could be achieved along the lines of the above query, the situation could, of course, be satisfactorily handled. However, it is the position of the Social Security Board that, since Congress bases its appropriations for the use of the States on work-load estimates submitted by the Board, the allotments to the States must be controlled by developments concerning these work-load criteria. Only to the extent that there are increases in the work load may the States, under present Board practices, expect an increase in their administrative grants. Aside from crippling the States in the handling of their present work loads this Board practice obviously does not allow the States such additional sums as are presently necessary to make even minimum preparations for increased work loads prior to their actual occurrence.

We ask your assistance in accomplishing the following:

(1) A restoration in the Senate of at least the \$31,000,000 figure originally estimated by the Social Security Board. We hold that this is hardly more than adequate to meet existing work loads, to say nothing of making even a minimum provision for future contingencies. In the event that this item is adjusted in the Senate, we solicit our Members in the House to communicate the position of the States to the Member of the House on the Conference Committee that will ultimately adjust the figure.

(2) An incorporation in the Senate committee report (re H. R. 4899) instructing the Board, in the making of grants to the States, to be guided not only by current work-load estimates but also to give due consideration to the necessity of timely and adequate advance preparation on the part of the States to meet sudden and greatly increased work loads.

Admittedly, the ensuing fiscal year holds too many imponderables to permit at this time a very accurate calculation of the administrative expenses of State agencies. However, it is a near certainty that there will be a great increase in unemployment compensation claims relative to their present minimum level. It is likewise a certainty that if the States are to meet successfully a considerable increase in claim loads advance preparation is necessary. Advance prepara-

tion involves the ordering of forms, supplies, and certain equipment which will necessarily encumber funds beyond the proportions of the present work-load figures.

It is the duty of the Board to make grants to the States on the basis of the amounts "necessary for the proper and efficient administration" (sec. 302 (a) of the Social Security Act). Proper and efficient administration in our judgment involves advance preparation to meet conditions that appear to be in the rather immediate offing.

It is our understanding that all State unemployment compensation agencies are to communicate with their congressional delegation. We think that if Congress can be correctly apprised of the situation some corrective steps may yet be taken.

We feel assured that we can rely on your favorable consideration of our problem.

Very truly yours,

VOYTA WRABETZ,
Chairman.

Mr. WILEY. As I understand the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, he declines my request?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I am obliged to do so. The committee passed upon the question after hearings and came to the conclusion that \$25,000,000 was ample for the purpose. The House had done the same thing. For that reason the figure was left at \$25,000,000. I have no authority to agree to a change. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment, because if for any reason the amount should prove insufficient, of course Congress will provide additional appropriations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in line with what the distinguished Senator has said, I merely wish to point out what the writer of the letter has to say on that subject:

It is clear that if the States are to meet the impending impact of unemployment, they must begin now to prepare for it. Although much paper planning has been done, little actual preparation has been undertaken. The Social Security Board has felt constrained to hold the States within the limits of their immediate work load—so much so that the approximately \$2,000,000 balance, above referred to, which sum could well have been spent in the purchase of supplies, forms, and equipment, which require considerable time for delivery, apparently will be allowed to lapse.

I understand the committee did not give the States a chance to be heard.

I understand also that the \$31,000,000 is simply for overhead, which is badly needed to meet the challenges of the future.

I ask that the figures "\$25,000,000", in line 11, on page 41, be stricken, and that in place thereof there be inserted "\$31,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only way that could be accomplished at this time would be by unanimous consent. Does the Senator make that request?

Mr. WILEY. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am compelled to object at this time, because the House committee and the Senate committee have considered this matter, and have refused to agree to such an increase. So I cannot agree to accept it.

¹Of interest is the statement made by BUTLER HARE, chairman of the subcommittee, in presenting the \$25,000,000 to the House. "We may have made some mistakes in our conclusions and I shall not attempt to justify them further than to say that if there are any they can be attributed to the failure to secure more thorough and complete information." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 29, p. 5188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the present parliamentary situation is such that an amendment can be offered only by unanimous consent or by a motion that the Senate reconsider its action in ordering the third reading of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not insist on observance of the technicalities which exist because of the parliamentary situation.

As a matter of fact, this question is rather an important one. I will say, if my colleague will permit me to do so, that, had I been advised of this situation sooner, I certainly would have gone before the Appropriations Committee. But, as I understand the situation, the reason why the matter was not called to the attention of Senators who are not members of the committee was because of the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. It was understood that the bill would be held up until he returned; at least, that was the information I received over the telephone yesterday.

I had fully intended to offer or join in support of an amendment of this nature. In view of the fact that the bill has reached its present parliamentary status sooner than I, certainly, had anticipated, or else I would have been on the floor, I hope the Senator will not prevent us from having an opportunity to discuss this question and to permit the Senate then to decide on what it thinks should be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, after the Appropriations Committee of each House and after both Houses have agreed on the item, I think it should remain as it is; but, under the circumstances, if the Senators wish to have a vote on this particular question, and if the senior Senator from Wisconsin or the junior Senator from Wisconsin wishes to offer an amendment to change the item \$25,000,000 to \$31,000,000—is that the idea?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that was the amendment my colleague intended to offer, if he were permitted to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me ask what is the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is that on page 41 of the bill, in line 11, the figures "\$25,000,000" be stricken out, and "\$31,000,000" be substituted. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the order for the third reading of the bill been set aside by proper parliamentary action?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has requested unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House disallowed it, and the Senate Committee—

Mr. RUSSELL. I am familiar with the item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to that action. However, I had understood there were some other amendments the Senator proposed to offer. It seems to me that if we reopen the bill we should not set aside the action of the Senate in ordering the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope no other amendments will be offered, because we wish to conclude consideration of the appropriation bills as soon as possible.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no amendment of my own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the request, as I understand, applies only to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, relative to the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee, I would say that if we reopen the bill, it is reopened.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President. As I understand the situation, the request is made to return to page 41 and to offer an amendment changing the figures "\$25,000,000" to "\$31,000,000." That is my understanding of the request.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; I withdraw what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$31,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, unless my colleague desires to speak further on this matter at this time, I should like to make a brief statement. As Senators know, there is provision in the Social Security Act for the Federal Government to carry the expense of the administration of unemployment compensation at the State levels. The State organizations are greatly concerned in regard to this item. They feel that a reduction to \$25,000,000 would seriously cripple administration, and that in the long run in all probability the effect would be to increase the drain on unemployment compensation funds, because the reduction would result, according to my information, in a curtailment of the necessary investigations made of cases which are presented by individuals asking for unemployment compensation.

As Senators must realize, a person who is in covered employment and who presents a claim for unemployment compensation has a prima facie right to such compensation; and so, unless the administrative agencies at the State levels are sufficiently equipped to investigate those cases, there will be a failure to ascertain the bona fides of the claims for unemployment compensation.

Furthermore, there is the necessity for the State agencies to carry a larger load than would appear from a super-

ficial examination of the statistics. It is true that because of the manpower shortage and high levels of employment the actual cases—the case load, so to speak—of persons receiving unemployment compensation have declined. But, on the other hand, because of the tremendous increase in employment and the coming into being of new companies and new corporations, the administrative expense in connection with the collection of the funds and keeping the records has increased.

The Social Security Board originally recommended to the Budget Bureau the sum of \$34,000,000, which was approximately \$500,000 more than the Budget estimate of last year; but the Budget Bureau cut the figure to \$31,000,000. The House committee reduced it to \$25,000,000, and the Senate committee has reaffirmed that action by not changing the bill in that respect as it came from the House of Representatives. It will be noted that the reduction is rather drastic, and that it can only come out of the administrative operations at the State level.

As we know—and I think we may as well be frank about it—there is a conflict between the Social Security Board and the State unemployment compensation insurance agencies. The Board and the Federal Security Administrator have advocated federalization of unemployment compensation. That issue, of course, is not directly involved in this item, but, nevertheless, the States are apprehensive that if they have to meet such a drastic cut in their administrative expenses, and are unable efficiently to operate, it will be asserted against them, and will become an additional argument on the part of those who wish to federalize the system.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about Senators being interested in not having the Federal Government take over all functions of the States. Yet if this amendment should prevail, there would be a drastic cut in the administrative expenses of the State agencies which, it is contended by them, will impair the efficiency of their operation. I think the Senate should hesitate before it takes the action proposed by the bill, especially since it would appear from the information contained in the letter sent to me by Mr. Voyta Wrabetz, chairman of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, which administers the law in Wisconsin, that the action of the House of Representatives was taken largely because it saw that the case load had gone down, and therefore it thought that the administrative expenses could be reduced. But that is not the situation as presented to me by the State agency which administers the law in Wisconsin.

Although my colleague has had the letter inserted in the RECORD, I will read from it for the benefit of Senators.

The \$34,000,000 estimated by the Board—

That means the Social Security Board—

was reduced to \$31,000,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. The \$31,000,000 was, in turn, further reduced (and rather arbitrarily, and without reference to any definite criteria, as the record will show) to \$25,000,000 by the

Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. The reasoning, contained in the committee report—

That is the House committee's report—of the House group recommending the reduction demonstrates a sufficient basis for the concern of State agencies:

"The \$25,000,000 provided in the bill is a reduction of \$6,000,000 from the Budget estimate and a reduction of \$10,328,000 from the 1944 appropriation. Under this item of expense is performed the collection of contributions and the payment of benefits under unemployment-compensation features of the social-security program. At this time the program in connection with the collection of contributions has increased due to the increased number of persons employed. On the other hand, the work in connection with the payment of benefits has decreased, and, in the opinion of the committee, should decrease much more. It is reported that an average of approximately 100,000 persons are receiving unemployment benefits each week. There is little excuse for persons to be unemployed in this country today. The need for manpower is greater now than ever before, and any general unemployment is inexcusable and should not be encouraged by the payment of unemployment benefits."

That ends the quotation from the House committee report.

Mr. President, it seems to me that after a man has made contributions, and is unemployed, under the safeguards established under the unemployment-compensation statutes to pay him something to which he is entitled does not encourage unemployment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator hit the nub of the situation when he said that this is a strong movement to federalize unemployment insurance, and that now would be an inappropriate time for those who believe in State regulation of unemployment insurance to reduce the funds so they would not be sufficient to enable the act to be effectively administered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that nothing I said was intended to imply that the Board was making this move for the purpose stated. It recommended to the Budget Bureau an appropriation of \$34,000,000; but the amount was cut to \$31,000,000 by the Budget Bureau, and has now been cut to \$25,000,000 by the House. The amount, as reported by the Senate committee, remains at \$25,000,000. What I said, and wish to repeat, is that the effort to federalize the system has caused some agencies to be apprehensive that if their funds are drastically reduced, and they are thereby unable efficiently to discharge their responsibilities under the law, such inefficiency will subsequently be charged to them and will be used as a further argument for federalization.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As bearing out what the Senator has said, I have received within the hour a telegram from Mr. William L. McKee, chairman of Vermont Unemployment Compensation Commission,

protesting against the reduction of \$6,000,000 in the appropriation for the unemployment-compensation program. If the protest had come from some other source I should have been inclined to pay little attention to it; but having come from a Vermont commission I think we should take it seriously, because Vermont commissions do not ask for increases in appropriations on the part of the Federal Government unless there is sound and good reason for doing so.

As the Senator has so ably stated, for a long time there has been a fear on the part of the State commissions that some day the program might become wholly federalized, and the States might have nothing more to say about the operation of the program. Such a fear is expressed in the telegram to which I have referred, wherein Mr. McKee says:

Such drastic reduction will prevent proper investigations resulting in expansion of benefit payments which in turn will affect full utilization of manpower.

In other words, it is the fear of the commission that it will not be able to do efficient work.

It has been said that the money appropriated could be used, and then the commissions could come back for a deficiency appropriation; but State commissions do not work in that way. If an appropriation is made for a year they will plan their program so as to make the appropriation last for the year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Furthermore, if the Senator from Vermont will pardon me, under the law the Social Security Board will be required to budget on a monthly basis, spreading over the whole fiscal year, whatever amount the Congress appropriates for this purpose. Under the language reported by the committee, we have no hope that there may be any elasticity permitting more rapid expenditure of the money in the early months of the fiscal year and a diminution of it later. So, unless the Congress provides sufficient money, we can assume and must assume the responsibility for having drastically cut this appropriation, and thus crippled the efficiency of the State agencies.

I wish further to read briefly from the comments of Mr. Wrabetz in his letter concerning the House committee report, which was the alleged justification for this drastic cut. He says:

One can infer from the above-cited excerpt that the committee supposed that the appropriations recommended by it were to be directly used in the making of benefit payments. Thus, it was reasoned that there was no excuse for the payment of benefits at this time, therefore sums would not be made available for making such payments.

The clear basic fact is that if it is desired to hold benefit payments to a minimum at this time—and, of course, this is desirable—more money, not less money, is necessary for administrative purposes. Persons claiming unemployment compensation under State laws are prima facie entitled thereto, and it is up to the administrative agencies to rebut the prima facie showing by investigating the claimant's status. Any material cut in appropriations that would make necessary further reductions in our field office and investigating staff might well mean a great expansion in benefit payments.

Although reference is made in the committee reports to functions performed by the State agencies other than benefit payments, sufficient recognition was not given to these other functions. The problem of contribution collection is now greatly magnified by reason of increased pay rolls and the type and nature of many employers in the field of war production.

I am certain that every Senator is familiar with that fact. In the effort to expand production more and more companies, even very small companies in some instances, have been brought in to help speed up war production. That has increased the administrative burden upon the State agencies in the collection of unemployment contributions.

The processing of wage records relating to the greatly increased numbers of covered employers, which is a necessary prerequisite to the payment of future benefits, is also of greatly increased proportions.

Every Senator will appreciate that that point is well taken. In the tremendous increase in the number of persons gainfully employed in covered occupations the administrative burden upon the State agencies has grown directly in proportion to that increase. Yet, it is proposed to cut this item to \$25,000,000, which is \$9,000,000 less than the Board recommended, and which is a reduction from the 1944 appropriation of \$10,000,000.

Also, to meet even our minimum benefit-payment load it is necessary to maintain at least a skeleton staff in our field offices.

The question may be asked: "Why should the States concern themselves at this time with the appropriation figure in H. R. 4899?" Why not spend it so as to efficiently meet their present operating load and to make reasonable advance preparation for the rather definitely foreseeable crisis ahead? In the event that the amount proves insufficient then the Congress will make a deficiency appropriation.

But, Mr. President, that cannot be done. The Board will be forced to budget over the entire fiscal year whatever sum we provide to pay the State compensation agencies for their administrative expenses.

I think, Mr. President, from every standpoint that we are in a reasonable position in asking only for what the Budget allowed. It is a reduction from last year's appropriation, and is a reduction of \$3,000,000 in the amount which the Social Security Board recommended to the Budget Bureau. If we make this drastic cut now we must accept full responsibility for impairing the efficiency which will follow in the administration by the States of the unemployment-compensation law, and in that way we will be weakening their position in the struggle which is bound to ensue over whether unemployment compensation shall be completely federalized. In the light of the facts we have presented I cannot believe that the position taken is untenable or unreasonable.

I may say that Mr. Wrabetz is a conscientious public servant. He has served for many years as chairman of the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, and I can state that Senators may rely upon

the conservative character of the statement which he makes in this communication.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator explain from what funds the \$25,000,000 comes if it is appropriated? Is it a part of the amount which the citizen pays as a tax and which is set apart by the Federal Government for administration; so that in reality, if I understand it correctly, the money belongs already to the States, and it is merely a question as to what extent the Federal Government shall control the amount the States shall expend? Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Federal Government's control, of course, of the expenditures made by the State agencies is supreme; there is no limitation whatsoever on it. If we sought to exercise plenary power we could refuse to appropriate anything and the State agencies would have to go out of business. We have the power, and I think, likewise, we have the responsibility. Since under the original Social Security Act the principle was established of providing a Federal tax and then permitting the States to administer it according to their laws, we have a double responsibility to make certain not to impair the activities of the State agencies and not to cripple them and make them inefficient and liable to attack. On that ground I think that we are even more in a position where we should exercise caution than we would be if it were a Federal system and the Federal Government had sole responsibility for its administration.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont with pleasure.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin conceive the sum of money from which the \$25,000,000 would be paid to be in the hands and under the control of the Federal Government as a trustee for the States?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the appropriation is one made out of the Treasury.

Mr. AUSTIN. Regardless of the money which has been contributed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The money comes into the Treasury as the result of the Federal tax.

Mr. AUSTIN. But it is paid by the employer and the employee, is it not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it is a joint contribution.

Mr. AUSTIN. So that it is the money of the citizens, appropriated to a special purpose, held by the Federal Government and administered by the Federal Government, is it not?

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REED. The tax is collected by the Federal Government. The Federal Government is allowed three-tenths of 1 percent for collecting it. Then, in turn, the administration is by the State agencies and through the State agencies. The

Congress makes an appropriation every year.

In conclusion on that point, out of the three-tenths of 1 percent the Federal Government has accumulated in excess of \$450,000,000 above its expenses. So there is no question of this operation costing the Federal Government anything.

Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that in the Committee on Appropriations I rather took the view he is taking, and favored leaving the appropriation at \$31,000,000. However, the committee concluded not to do that, and I was not impressed with any great threat to the efficient administration of the workmen's compensation law. If I had been, I perhaps would have submitted minority views.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator from Kansas will pardon me, I stated, I think perhaps before he entered the Chamber, that I was not put on notice concerning this matter until yesterday afternoon, when the bill had already been reported from the committee. I explained that the information which came to me was that the State agencies had not anticipated that the bill would be reported so soon; they understood that there was a sort of a gentleman's agreement that the Senator from Nevada would be permitted to return before the bill was reported. Then it was found that in the interest of hurrying it through, the committee could not wait for the return of the Senator from Nevada, and so notified him by telegram. Then the State agencies began, in desperation, to get in touch with Senators who they thought might be interested in the matter.

I wish to say again that it is always my practice to go before the committee, because I think the committee has the right to have advance knowledge of the intention of any Senator with regard to amendments. But in all the hurly-burly, and because of the number of committees I have had to attend in the past few days, I may say frankly that this item in the bill had not been brought to my attention until I received a long-distance telephone call yesterday, and then Mr. Wrabetz's letter came shortly thereafter by air mail. Otherwise, I certainly should have gone before the committee, where I have always received the most courteous reception, and I should not be pressing the matter on the floor of the Senate. I would have gone before the committee first, but it was then too late, for the bill had already been reported.

Mr. REED. The 30th of June does not wait upon the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not asking that it wait; I am only asking an opportunity to justify this last-minute effort to prevent something from happening about which the agencies in the States charged with the responsibility of administering the law are deeply concerned. I feel sure that if they had had an opportunity to impress the importance of this matter upon the Senator from Kansas as it has been impressed upon me, he would now realize the seriousness of the proposed reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have not heard a word of objection from the workmen's compensation authorities administering the law in Kansas. If they have any objection, if they have any ideas about the sum which should be allowed, they certainly have failed to advise me.

I wish to say again to the Senator from Wisconsin that in the committee I took rather the position the Senator from Wisconsin is now taking; but I was not impressed with any threat to the efficient administration of the law. If there is a threat, if it should develop in the experience of the next fiscal year that we did not appropriate enough, there will always be a deficiency appropriation available.

I know the Senator from Wisconsin says this money is budgeted, and that is correct, but, after all, it is possible to begin the distribution of money even though it was not originally included in the Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall yield in a moment. I regret that this matter has not been brought to the attention of the committee. I regret that it has not been brought to the individual attention of Senators. If I am guilty of laches in any respect, I accept full responsibility for it.

I may say, however, very frankly, that I did not know about the item until after the committee had reported the bill; but I do have great respect for Mr. Wrabetz's judgment. He has been chairman of the industrial commission in Wisconsin under all political parties. He is a conscientious, high-class public servant, and no one can read his letter without coming to the conclusion that he is exceedingly disturbed about the matter, and in the letter, portions of which I have read, he sets forth the reasons why the load has not diminished, as the House committee contended in its report it had.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin, and to other Senators who are interested in the matter, that the \$31,000,000 is entirely for compensation to those who administer the law. It is all a question of compensation to them. It does not affect what is paid as unemployment compensation.

Mr. REED. It takes care of the administrative expenses.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, and that is what makes the House committee's paragraph on this subject so fallacious. They say no one should be unemployed now, and therefore we should not be encouraging unemployment by paying unemployment benefits. Not a penny of this money goes to unemployment benefits; it goes for the administrative expenses of State agencies.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will permit me, it includes the collection and handling of the tax collected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, and the increase in the number of persons who are covered and the increase in the number of collections the agencies have to make have increased the load, rather

than diminished it. The only feature of the load that has diminished is the actual payment of the unemployment compensation benefits; but, as pointed out in Mr. Wrabetz's letter, if the number of persons available for service is reduced to the number of persons making application for unemployment compensation, instead of reducing the number of people who are receiving unemployment compensation, we are moving in the direction of encouraging and permitting people to obtain unemployment compensation who do not have just claim to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony before the committee of the House, and the committee of the Senate also, was to the effect that unemployment compensation was at an all-time low, that unemployment in this country was at an all-time low, and that it was not necessary to retain a large number of employees and to go to the great expense heretofore entailed, when the business of paying unemployment compensation had been reduced to an all-time low.

There is much sense in that. The House felt that that was very cogent, and that it was not necessary to maintain large organizations, with an enormous number of employees, when there are now comparatively few unemployed. If that does not make sense, then I am incapable of understanding.

The fund involved is collected on a percentage basis; it is in the Treasury, and it can be used at any time when necessary. But why keep the enormous number of employees in the various States to carry on a very much smaller business than unhappily had to be conducted before? I hope it will not be so great in the future as it has been in the past. Even this year there was a large amount paid back to the Treasury.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the able Senator from Tennessee falls into the same unfortunate position which the House committee fell into. They simply looked at the number of persons who are now receiving unemployment compensation and jumped to the conclusion that therefore a drastic slash could be made in the appropriations provided for the expense of the State agencies. They did not recognize, as the Senator from Tennessee does not recognize, that, while it is true, because of high levels of employment, that the payment of unemployment benefits has been reduced, the fact remains that other factors created by the war have increased the burden on the State agencies. That ought to be clear to everyone; it ought to make common sense to everyone. When the number of covered workers is largely increased, as it has been during this war, the work of administration at the State level becomes much heavier, because a record has to be made and kept of every one of those persons. The fact that more and more corporations and small companies have become engaged in the effort to help expand war production, of itself increases

the administrative burden and the administrative expense. It is true the work has decreased in one respect, but it has increased in others which more than overcome the reduction incident to the payment of unemployment compensation benefits. We are not asking for an increase in the appropriation; we are asking only for the amount which the Budget Bureau allowed, which is \$3,000,000 less than the amount the Social Security Board first recommended to the Bureau of the Budget and is a drastic cut below what was granted last year. So, all the slack that could be taken out without impairing the efficiency of the State administrations, because of the reduction in the number of persons who are now receiving unemployment compensation, has been taken out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think there is still another phase to this matter to which the able Senator from Wisconsin has not yet adverted. I refer to the part which the State administrations of unemployment compensation are inevitably going to play in the post-war conversion program of the Government itself. The so-called George post-war economic planning committee was in session all morning today and dealt for 2 hours with the part which unemployment insurance must play in the reconversion program. We came to the conclusion, I am sure I am entitled to say, that there has got to be an increasing administrative load put upon State unemployment compensation organizations in dealing with the matter in the fashion in which we hope it may be dealt with. I can give the Senator one example. At the present time the Federal standard covers only employers of eight or more employees. We are recommending—we cannot do it ourselves, because it has to originate elsewhere—but we are recommending that the coverage shall be reduced in respect to the number of employees employed by an employer. Our whole post-war program in relation to unemployment compensation, which inevitably is going to be a key part of the post-war program, contemplates a tremendously increased burden upon State unemployment compensation administrations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the valuable contribution which the Senator from Michigan has made to the discussion, and I think it is a point which ought to be borne in mind by Senators in determining how they will vote on the question, because, with that in contemplation, to impair the efficiency of the organization and, in the present war manpower situation, to permit it to be disintegrated to some extent, at the very time when it may have an additional burden dumped on it, would seem to be entirely unjustified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Senator how much the Federal Government derives from the three-tenths of 1 percent which comes to the Federal Government. Is it not far more than its administrative cost?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes. The fund has grown to some three hundred or four hundred million dollars, I think the Senator from Kansas stated.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Governor McNutt told the committee that up to the present time the excess of collections from the three-tenths of 1 percent over what has actually been paid out to the States for administration purposes, is \$400,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that the Federal Government collects approximately \$150,000,000 a year and pays out only \$31,000,000. The remainder it places in the Treasury.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. So it seems to be only fair that out of that amount the unemployment compensation agencies shall have a sufficient sum for administration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. I think the Senator has made a very valid point.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I trust that the amendment offered by my colleague will be agreed to, and I hope it will stay in the bill in conference, because, from the investigation I have been able to make of the matter, I am convinced that this drastic cut would have a very serious effect upon the efficiency of the State organizations which by statute we have charged with the responsibility of administering this law.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is what the House committee had to say about this matter:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: The \$25,000,000 provided in the bill is a reduction of \$6,000,000 from the Budget estimate, and a reduction of \$10,328,000 from the 1944 appropriation. Under this item of expense is performed the collection of contributions and the payment of benefits under unemployment compensation features of the social-security program. At this time the work in connection with the collection of contributions has increased due to the increased number of persons employed. On the other hand, the work in connection with the payment of benefits has decreased and in the opinion of the committee should decrease much more. It is reported that an average of approximately 100,000 persons are receiving unemployment benefits each week. There is little excuse for persons to be unemployed in this country today. The need for manpower is greater now than ever before and any general unemployment is inexcusable and should not be encouraged by the payment of unemployment benefits.

That is the reason which actuated the House.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator immediately, as a matter of elementary common sense, recognize that the moment hostilities cease the trend will turn in exactly the opposite direction, and the burden of labor will infinitely multiply? Surely the Senator hopes for that happy conclusion, at least in respect to the termination of hostilities, within the next fiscal year.

Mr. McKELLAR. While that may be true, we do not know when the war will end. This agency will always be at liberty to come to Congress and obtain whatever appropriations may be necessary for that purpose. But why maintain a large organization now, when unemployment is at the lowest figure since the system was inaugurated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can give the Senator one answer specifically. If the recommendation which was unanimously agreed upon this morning in the George committee becomes effective, the coverage of unemployment compensation will increase to the extent of 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 additional employees within the next fiscal year, as rapidly as it can be done. So, in anticipation of this reconversion program, it is perfectly evident that the burden of administrative labor, regardless of the effect on benefits themselves, will inevitably substantially multiply.

Mr. McKELLAR. Heretofore we have had widespread unemployment. Before the war there was a great amount of unemployment and a vast organization was required. The House thought—and I believe the House was correct—that if we should continue to maintain an organization costing the Government \$31,000,000 at a time when unemployment is at its lowest point, we could not justify such an expense. We are taxing the people for it.

There was testimony on this point. Let me read from the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. What was the reason why the House reduced the amount to \$25,000,000?

Mr. ALTMAYER. The House indicated that it ought to be reduced because, as the committee said, work in connection with the payment of benefits has decreased; but, as a matter of fact, that decrease had already been taken into account when we made our estimate of the \$31,000,000. That \$31,000,000 is \$2,300,000 less than the actual administrative expenses will be this fiscal year, and it is \$4,300,000 less than the current appropriation for this fiscal year. We feel that if this reduction of \$6,000,000 is made it will seriously impair the functioning of the 51 different unemployment compensation agencies.

In other words, a reduction in the appropriation would mean a reduction in the size of the organization. It would cost less money. Not so many employees would be required. Manpower is needed everywhere in the Government at this time to carry on the war; and yet we are maintaining an enormous number of employees throughout the country at a cost of \$31,000,000, which is the amount which was appropriated when there was great unemployment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure the Senator will testify that I am about as enthusiastic a bureau demobilizer as there is in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is. I am surprised at his position on this question. It is not the purpose of the committee to fail to pay every dollar of unemployment benefits to which applicants may be entitled. Of course, when times change, the situation will be different, as has been suggested. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] suggested a few moments ago that we ought to maintain this organization so as to be ready when the war is over, when there will be a greater amount of unemployment. That will undoubtedly be true; but we can take care of that need when it arises. Congress will be in session substantially all the time. As the House well says, in my judgment, we encourage unemployment, when for the purpose contemplated we pay out vast sums at a time such as this.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to follow up the concession which I obtained from the Senator a moment ago, namely, that a pretty good case would be required to satisfy me that any bureau in Washington could not be substantially reduced, or that any bureau in any State could not be substantially reduced without impairing its public service.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So I submit to the Senator that he must concede, so far as I am concerned, that I would not have reached this conclusion unless there was a reason for it. Everything that occurred in the House, and everything that occurred in his committee, occurred ahead of the crystallization of the reconversion and post-war plans upon which we are now working, and which we are just bringing to a climax.

I say to the Senator that in my judgment—and I believe in the judgment of our post-war planners—there can be no effective reconversion program without a very substantial reliance upon State unemployment-compensation administrations, which will probably face a far larger responsibility and a far greater load of work during the next fiscal year than they ever had before in the history of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me read further from the hearings:

Senator REED. Approximately what is the number of recipients of unemployment compensation?

Mr. ALTMAYER. At the present time there are about 83,000 beneficiaries who are drawing unemployment-compensation benefits throughout the entire United States, Territories, and possessions.

There are 83,000 beneficiaries, and the committee has recommended an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to administer the payment of unemployment benefits to 83,000 recipients. To my mind that is a very large sum, and should be ample to meet the need. It may not be enough to keep on the pay roll every person who is now in office in the various States

under this organization; but it is sufficient to make sure that the recipients of unemployment benefits shall receive such benefits at the right time. The House thought so; the Senate committee thought so; and it can be seen from reading the testimony that, so far as the operators of this organization are concerned, they desired to obtain a large sum merely because they did not wish to take any chances.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's argument seems to come down to saying that because temporarily the payment of unemployment benefits is at a low ebb, due to the fact that there is comparatively little unemployment, we should demobilize a substantial part of the personnel which operates the system normally. I submit to the Senator that it would be just about as logical to discharge all the firemen in Washington between fires.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; I do not agree with the Senator.

I will read further from the testimony of this witness:

Senator REED. About what is the average payment, stated annually?

Mr. ALTMAYER. It runs about \$15 a week.

Senator REED. You still have not given the annual amount.

Mr. ALTMAYER. Oh, the annual amount?

Senator REED. Yes.

Mr. ALTMAYER. The annual amount, I think, would now run probably about \$60,000,000.

Frankly, Mr. President, I say to my brother Senators that it seems to me that \$25,000,000 to provide employees to disburse \$60,000,000 is a very heavy sum. I do not know the exact percentage, but in round numbers, it is between 45 percent and 50 percent. To pay \$25,000,000 to the personnel of the agency which administers \$60,000,000 is an astounding thing. To increase that amount so that it will cost the Government more than half as much as the amount of the benefits themselves seems to me to be too much. I do not remember the exact amount paid to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, but it is more than \$5,000,000. Think of our paying 50 percent to the employees who pay us. No one could defend it; no one would defend it.

I think we are very liberal in paying the employees who disburse the \$60,000,000; \$25,000,000 to be paid to them for disbursing unemployment compensation to the beneficiaries under the law is a tremendous amount, and, frankly, I cannot vote for it. I will have to vote the other way.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am sure the Senator does not wish to leave with the Senate the impression that all the State unemployment compensation commissions do is disburse money. They also have to collect it, and they have to keep individual records of every covered employee in the State, with respect to his eligibility for benefits.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; they have to collect the money. During the short time I have been in the Congress of the United States, have found that it has not been a very laborious task for me to receive from the Government the checks I am paid at its hands. I think one of the most delightful things in the world is to receive checks.

The compensation commissions have to keep account of the checks, it is true. They have to keep a record of the names. They have to pay out \$60,000,000 to the 83,000 persons who receive benefits. But that is not such a burden that it should cost the Government \$25,000,000. To my mind, \$25,000,000 is an enormous cost. I should like to have Senators think about it before they vote to increase above the sum of \$25,000,000 the appropriation for keeping the books and paying \$60,000,000 to unemployed persons, for it seems to me to be a large sum.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this subject. I should like to clear up, if possible, some misunderstanding. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota spoke inadvertently when he said the State commissions collect the money. The money is paid by the employer, who deducts it from the wages paid to the wage earners. That amount, plus the employer's own contribution, is paid by him.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is three-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in my State there is a merit rating system for employers. Under it, when they have a record for stabilized employment, their contributions decrease. I grant that the State does not collect the funds, but the State must have a record of what every employee has contributed and of the benefits he has received from what he has contributed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the State commissions do not collect the money. It is paid to the Government. The collections amount to approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year. Of that amount the Government may retain three-tenths of 1 percent for its expenses. The payments for unemployment are made through the State commissions. The State commissions, in order to make such payments properly, must have a record for every employee. While the tax is not paid to the State commissions, it is necessary for them, in order to administer the payments, to have a record of each employee.

The total amount paid last year for unemployment was approximately \$60,000,000. That is a very small sum, and is much smaller than the average or the normal amount. I have no doubt, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that with the end of the war, the readjustment of business, and the return from the war of the members of the armed forces that amount will very largely increase.

From the three-tenths of 1 percent allowed the Government for collection, there has accumulated in the Treasury of the United States \$450,000,000, in round numbers, that amount being above the amount of the expenses incurred by

the Federal Government in making the collection.

In the committee, I took the position that I thought it was better to leave the appropriation for the State unemployment commissions at \$31,000,000. The appropriation for this year is approximately \$35,000,000. I think the estimate for the next fiscal year is \$34,000,000.

As I now recall, the Bureau of the Budget recommended a reduction to \$31,000,000. The House reduced the amount to \$25,000,000. The controversy here is over the question whether the House made a mistake in reducing the amount from \$31,000,000 to \$25,000,000, and whether we should restore the \$31,000,000 figure.

I have no pride of opinion concerning this question. As a matter of fact, my own opinion was contrary to the opinion of the majority of the committee. But, in all fairness, it should be stated that the House passed the bill on June 1. The State commissions are fairly energetic about following these matters. If there ever was any complaint from anyone that the amount provided in the bill as it passed the House would impair the efficiency of administration in the States through the State commissions, it never reached me, until the Senator from Wisconsin took the floor today. My own State is fairly vocal, let me say. Kansas does not sit back and fail to express its dissent or disapproval. But I have received no complaint of any kind, either directly or indirectly, verbal or in any other way, from my State about this \$25,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that, so far as I know, I have received no complaint about it.

Mr. REED. So I was surprised when the Senator from Wisconsin took the floor and spoke of the complaint he had received. I do not know anything about the State official whose letter he has read. I have no doubt he is all the Senator from Wisconsin has said he is. But, Mr. President, in the Appropriations Committee, I have earnestly striven to keep the appropriations at the lowest possible minimum. So I went along with the Senator in the committee, even though I, myself, had some doubt. But I do not believe the unemployment compensation work is threatened with disaster if we do not restore the \$31,000,000 figure.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the energy and efficiency with which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has been pressing for the consideration of the appropriation bills during recent weeks. Both as chairman of the subcommittee and acting chairman of the full committee, he has moved the appropriation bills along with the utmost speed.

I think that the particular item under consideration is illustrative of the necessity of sending it to conference in order that it may have the consideration which it fully deserves and did not fully obtain

during consideration of the bill by the committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Ohio may have made a worth-while point. If we write \$25,000,000 into this bill, as the House has done, it will not be subject to any action by the conference except to be accepted by it. If we change it, it will then be open to consideration in the conference, and to being established at whatever sum between \$25,000,000 and \$31,000,000 is found to be desirable.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his statement, which is precisely what I wished to emphasize. If there is to be any modification of this figure from the \$25,000,000 adopted by the House it will be necessary for the Senate to insert some other figure in order that it may go to the conference committee for consideration.

I served as a member of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Appropriations, and no one called attention to these matters. I wish to point out that neither in the House nor in the Senate hearings did representatives of the States testify on this issue. They did not present their full case. Only within the past hour I received a telephone call from the superintendent of unemployment insurance of the State of Ohio emphasizing the fact that to his surprise the figure had been reduced to \$25,000,000, whereas \$31,000,000 was less than the amount actually spent during the past year. He stated that it would be absolutely necessary for the States to carry on their work as they are doing it now. I told him that when we voted in the committee to retain the House figure it was done with the assurance and with the belief that the difference could be covered by a deficiency appropriation. He stated that although there may be some question as to what will be required for the post-war period, there is no question as to what is required to take care of current needs. It may be possible to take care of the funds for post-war planning by a deficiency bill later in the fiscal year, but the current needs require the appropriation of \$31,000,000 now.

I wish to point out that this item of \$31,000,000 represents money which is to go to the States for the administration of unemployment compensation insurance. An amount of approximately \$60,000,000 is to be distributed to beneficiaries; \$1,000,000,000 is to be collected from those who are required to make payments, and a backlog of about \$5,000,000,000 is involved. It is a three-way operation. The operation consists of payments to beneficiaries which, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, is not a large operation, involving approximately only \$60,000,000 in these days of full employment. Therefore, if the entire \$25,000,000 or \$31,000,000 were required in order to distribute \$60,000,000 to beneficiaries, it would seem to be an exorbitant appropriation. But even in these days of full employment there is seen another side of the picture. Of

course, there is a small amount of disbursement for unemployment. There is a great amount of expenditure in connection with necessary administration in collecting and keeping track of the money and posting the payments which are received from employees in time of full employment.

It is pointed out that the sum which is involved, \$31,000,000, comes well within the funds collected for this purpose by the Government. It is \$4,300,000 less than the appropriation for this year and \$2,300,000 less than the actual expenses for this year.

Therefore, I believe the Senate would be wise to restore the figure to \$31,000,000, which is the figure, as I understand, recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and thus allow the item to go to conference where the conferees may take into consideration the arguments which are now, for the first time, coming in from many States directly involved in the consideration of this issue. The conferees, therefore, will be able to decide between the \$25,000,000 and the \$31,000,000. If it is not done in that way, the issue will be foreclosed, and, to use the words of Mr. Altmeyer, this would be the effect of it—I quote from his testimony before the Senate committee:

But, as I say, the \$31,000,000 requested for next year is \$4,300,000 less than this year's appropriation, or \$2,300,000 less than the sum to be actually expended.

Senator McKellar asked this question:

Will that \$25,000,000 allowed by the House cover it?

Mr. Altmeyer replied:

I am confident it will not cover it without serious loss of efficiency and the creation of an impossible situation for these State agencies.

So, Mr. President, those who believe in retaining and strengthening the State agencies should now vote to make the figure \$31,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Revercomb
Austin	Gurney	Robertson
Ball	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hawkes	Shipstead
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Butler	Lucas	Tydings
Byrd	McClellan	Vandenberg
Capper	McFarland	Wagner
Chavez	Maloney	Wallgren
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Millikin	Weeks
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdoch	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Willis
George	Reed	
Gerry		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] which I transfer to my colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how the Senator from Kentucky would vote if present and voting. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and Mr. SCRUGHAM are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] would vote "nay."

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and Mr. REYNOLDS, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired on this question with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—45

Alken	Gerry	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Shipstead
Ball	Hatch	Taft
Barkley	Hawkes	Truman
Bridges	Hill	Tunnell
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Butler	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Capper	La Follette	Wagner
Chavez	Lucas	Wallgren
Cordon	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Millikin	Weeks
Downey	Murdoch	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	Wiley
George	Pepper	Willis

NAYS—19

Bankhead	Holman	Robertson
Buck	McClellan	Russell
Bushfield	McKellar	Stewart
Byrd	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Moore	
Gurney	Reed	

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews	Glass	Overtton
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Guffey	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Jackson	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Nye	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	Wilson
Connally	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. WILEY's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on page 56, after line 23, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can do that only by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer an amendment on page 56, after line 23, to clarify that section of the bill.

Mr. McKellar. What is the section? Mr. BRIDGES. The National Labor Relations Board title, line 23, page 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, in line 23 to add these words:

The existence of an agreement or a renewal thereof between management and a labor organization on or before July 1, 1942, without complaint being filed by an employee or employees, shall, however, be prima facie evidence that the organization has not been formed in violation of such section 158.

The amendment merely clarifies the language so that there will not be any twilight zone. I think it is a sound amendment and should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In title IV, page 56, at the end of line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

The existence of an agreement or a renewal thereof between management and a labor organization on or before July 1, 1942, without complaint being filed by an employee or employees, shall, however, be prima facie evidence that the organization has not been formed in violation of such section 158.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4899) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representative thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON. I submit a conference report on the Navy Department appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8 and 9.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DAVID I. WALSH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. FLOESER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I inquire if the report was signed by the minority members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate?

Mr. OVERTON. It was signed by all Senators in attendance at the conference.

Mr. President, I wish to make a statement about the two amendments from which the Senate conferees receded. Amendment No. 8 relates to the war aviation field in Oklahoma where oil has been discovered. The amendment which the Senate proposed was to revest the title in the original owners of the land upon their returning the purchase price and reimbursing the Federal Govern-

ment for the cost of whatever improvements it had made.

Amendment numbered 9, from which we receded, was the provision that none of the funds shall be used by the Navy Department to build facilities where there are existing facilities either publicly or privately owned, which in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy could be obtained at a reasonable cost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

AIR ATTACK ON JAPANESE MAINLAND

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not wish the news to become stale that our B-29's, known as our Super Fortresses, have today bombed the mainland of Japan, without paying a word of tribute to all those who have had some part in the building of the marvelous air force which is responsible for that encouraging achievement. I know of nothing more illustrative of the greatness of the American people than their ability to start with a handful of airplanes at the time they were attacked by a vicious enemy in December 1941 and be able today to accomplish such a marvelous feat.

Too great credit cannot be given to General Arnold, who has fathered and pioneered our great and incomparable air force.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the B-29 airplane is made almost exclusively in Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that the Senator from Kansas is quite proud, and justly so of that airplane.

Mr. REED. I have visited the Boeing plant at Wichita, Kans., where the B-29 is made. I have visited there several times with the approval of the Army and the courtesy of the management of the plant. The factory is a marvelous one, and it is manufacturing one of the most wonderful airplanes of the age.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

To those who have been responsible for encouraging and stimulating an interest in the development of our air power, from Gen. Billy Mitchell and all who were associated with him down to Major de Seversky, we owe a great debt of gratitude. I am sure the heartfelt thanks of the millions of this country go out to those who created the magnificent fortresses of the air, and to the faithful men and women who have worked in the factories in accomplishing significant results. We are proud of their accomplishments. We know that they will rapidly hasten the crushing of the enemy and the establishment of permanent peace.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO WORK ON TUNNEL SITES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1479) providing

for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites, which was on page 1, line 5, to strike out "war" and insert "wars."

Mr. MURRAY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 4070, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 67.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "newspapers and periodicals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "teletype news service (not exceeding \$900)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and not to exceed \$35,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "\$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and including the temporary employment (not exceeding \$30,000) of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of of the said amendment, after the word "of", insert the words "more than four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "purchase of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 35, 57, 64, 65, and 66.

KENNETH B. MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,

Managers on the part of Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BRIDGES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the Senate considering at the moment?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have presented the conference report on the executive and independent offices appropriation bill. The House has agreed to the report. It is now proposed that the Senate complete action on the measure and send it to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I now ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House announcing its action on certain Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4070, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

June 15, 1944.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "appropriated" insert "subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as to the availability of manpower and subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 57 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "and accounted for as one

fund to be known as the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1945', to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944,' and the Tennessee Valley Authority shall file reports every 4 months with the two Appropriations Committees of the Congress of all its receipts and expenditures."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a period and the following: "Any officer or employee of the Government who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be summarily removed from office."

That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 64 and 66 to said bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in order to complete action on the bill I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 35, 57, and 65.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is almost impossible to know what is happening when we deal with amendments by number only. Will the Senator indicate what the amendments are?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will ask that the clerk be directed to read the House action on Senate amendment numbered 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 to the bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "appropriated" insert "subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as to the availability of manpower and subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials."

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what that means?

Mr. MCKELLAR. It provides for a release of certain critical war materials which have been impounded for some time. I am sure the Senator is in favor of it. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57. That deals with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House action on the amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 57 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "and accounted for as one fund to be known as the 'Tennessee Valley

Authority fund, 1945,' to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944,' and the Tennessee Valley Authority shall file reports every 4 months with the two appropriations committees of the Congress of all its receipts and expenditures."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senate conferees receded on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendment on which we had previously insisted before, and we agreed to an amendment to the House provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I now ask that the House action on the Senate amendment numbered 65 be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a period and the following: "Any officer or employee of the Government who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be summarily removed from office."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the substance of that amendment involves a receding by the Senate from the penalty it provided for unlawful use of Government-owned automobiles, and substitutes therefor dismissal from office?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator accurately states the matter. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 64 and 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. As I understand, that completes action on the bill, and it will now go to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4879, making appropriations for war agencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before action is taken on the motion I wish to say that there is one amendment in the bill which is supposed to go over until tomorrow, and I want some understanding about that before the Senate proceeds to consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I wish first to have an understanding as to the item on page 10, beginning in line 3, known as the appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, an item which has not heretofore been in the bill, and which ratifies the creation of an executive agency by the President. I wish to have an understanding that that provision shall not be considered today.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator spoke to me about that provision this morning, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatsoever to that particular item going over until tomorrow. As I understand there will be considerable discussion about it on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the provision be not considered before tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to be sure I understand the Senator's request. Is the Senator from Georgia asking that the item respecting the Committee on Fair Employment Practice go over until tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I ask that no action shall be taken on the item dealing with this agency until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4879.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

I must make an exception of the amendments in the section relating to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, on page 10, after line 2. It is my understanding that the entire section relating to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice will go over until tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that those amendments be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that has already been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit two amendments to the pending bill which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the

President," on page 4, after line 5, to strike out:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and expenses, Selective Service System: For all expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System as authorized by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (50 U. S. C. App. 301); including not to exceed \$400,000 for printing and binding; purchase, for replacement, of not to exceed 32 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and, under such rules or regulations as may be prescribed by the Director of Selective Service, expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization, of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the Selective Service law but such burial expenses shall not exceed \$150 in any one case; \$61,500,000: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be necessary shall be available for the planning, directing, and operation of a program of work of national importance under civilian direction, either independently or in cooperation with governmental or nongovernmental agencies, and the assignment and delivery thereto of individuals found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in work of the land or naval forces, which cooperation with other agencies may include the furnishing of funds to and acceptance of money, services, or other forms of assistance from such nongovernmental agencies for the more effectual accomplishment of the work; and for the pay and allowances of such individuals at rates not in excess of those paid to persons inducted into the Army under the Selective Service System, and such privileges as are accorded such inductees: *Provided further*, That the travel of persons engaged in the administration of the Selective Service System, including commissioned, warrant, or enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or their reserve components, may be ordered by the Director or by such persons as he may authorize, and persons so traveling shall be entitled to transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Director of Selective Service, in prescribing per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding \$7, in lieu of subsistence for officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and of the reserve components thereof, traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, pursuant to the first paragraph of section 12 of the act approved June 16, 1942 (37 U. S. C. 112), is hereby authorized to prescribe such per diem rates of allowance, whether or not orders are given to such officers for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, and without regard to the length of time away from their designated posts of duty under such orders.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. As I understand, the first amendment is to strike out certain language on page 4 of the bill and transfer it to some other place in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, there is no change in the substance.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the Presi-

dent—Office for Emergency Management—Division of Central Administrative Services", on page 8, line 13, after "(not to exceed \$50,000);", to strike out "\$7,783,000" and insert "\$8,356,000", and in line 14, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there may be transferred from this appropriation to appropriations available to the constituent agencies of the Office for Emergency Management and to other agencies such amounts as may be necessary in connection with the transfer of functions from the Division to such agencies and funds so transferred shall be consolidated with and shall be expendable in the same manner as funds of the agencies to which functions are transferred" and insert in lieu thereof the following provisos: "*Provided*, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from appropriations available to the constituent agencies of the Office for Emergency Management and to the Office of Price Administration such amounts as may be necessary for the procurement of supplies, equipment, and services for such agencies and such Administration, and funds so transferred shall be consolidated with and shall be expendable in the same manner as this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the constituent agencies (except the War Shipping Administration) of the Office for Emergency Management and the Office of Price Administration shall not establish, in the District of Columbia or in the field, fiscal, procurement, space allocation or procurement, duplicating, distribution, communication, or other general services, wherever the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines that the Division of Central Administrative Services can render any such service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Civilian Defense," on page 9, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$150,300" and insert "\$112,725"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$13,000" and insert "\$9,750"; in the same line, before the word "and", to strike out "\$538,500" and insert "\$403,875"; in line 19, before the word "for", to strike out "\$461,500" and insert "\$346,125", and in line 21, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee on Fair Employment Practice," on page 10, line 5, after the word "out", to strike out "the" and insert "any"; in the same line, after the word "functions", to insert "lawfully"; and in line 8, before the words "per annum", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$8,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into, the amendments under the subhead "Committee on Fair Employment Practice," on page 10, will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Coordinator of

Inter-American Affairs," on page 12, line 17, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$18,000,000" and insert "\$16,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at a subsequent meeting the committee voted to change the amount from \$16,000,000 to \$17,000,000. I therefore offer an amendment to the committee amendment, changing the amount from \$16,000,000 to \$17,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment on page 12, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Defense Transportation," on page 14, line 10, after the word "therefor", to strike out "\$18,000,000" and insert "\$17,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National War Labor Board", on page 14, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,606,000", and in line 24, after the name "United States", to strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$14,437,300".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of War Information", on page 19, line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "\$2,200,000" and insert "\$2,464,633"; in line 23, after the word "Director", to strike out the comma and "including book and magazine coordination sections" and insert a semicolon and "Book and Magazine Bureau; Foreign News Bureau;"; and on page 20, line 2, after the word "exceeding", to strike "\$50,000" and insert "\$54,428".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 19, to insert:

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and expenses, Selective Service System: For all expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System as authorized by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (50 U. S. C., App. 301); including not to exceed \$400,000 for printing and binding; purchase, for replacement, of not to exceed 32 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and, under such rules or regulations as may be prescribed by the Director of Selective Service, expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization, of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the selective-service law but such burial expenses shall not exceed \$150 in any one case; \$61,500,000: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be necessary shall be available for the planning, directing, and operation of a program of work of national importance under civilian direction, either independently or in cooperation with governmental or nongovernmental agencies, and the assignment and delivery thereto of individuals found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in work of the land or naval forces, which cooperation with other agencies may include the furnishing of funds to and acceptance of money, services, or other forms of assistance from such nongovernmental agencies for the more effectual accomplish-

ment of the work; and for the pay and allowances of such individuals at rates not in excess of those paid to persons inducted into the Army under the Selective Service System, and such privileges as are accorded such inductees: *Provided further*, That the travel of persons engaged in the administration of the Selective Service System, including commissioned, warrant, or enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or their reserve components, may be ordered by the Director or by such persons as he may authorize, and persons so traveling shall be entitled to transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Director of Selective Service, in prescribing per diem rates of allowances, not exceeding \$7, in lieu of subsistence for officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and of the reserve components thereof, traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, pursuant to the first paragraph of section 12 of the act approved June 16, 1942 (37 U. S. C. 112), is hereby authorized to prescribe such per diem rates of allowance, whether or not orders are given to such officers for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, and without regard to the length of time away from their designated posts of duty under such orders.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I send to the desk two amendments and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 2, in the committee amendment, after the word "binding" it is proposed to insert "and not to exceed \$1,000,000 for expenditure through other Federal agencies, and through State agencies without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, for gathering of medical and social history information on registrants"; and on page 30, line 11, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$61,500,000" and insert "\$62,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 29, after line 19, was agreed to, is reconsidered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 19, after the word "corporation", it is proposed to insert "including the salary of the Chairman of the Board at \$10,000 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, since the amendments on page 14, in the section relating to the National War Labor Board, were agreed to, I have been

handed a joint letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with reference to the reduction in the appropriation for the War Labor Board. It seems that the House of Representatives reduced the amount of the appropriation for the War Labor Board, and that the Senate committee reduced it still further, by a little more than half a million dollars. I do not intend to offer an amendment at this moment. I ask that the vote by which the amendments on page 14, lines 18 and 24, were agreed to, be reconsidered, so that tomorrow, after getting the facts, if I wish to offer an amendment I may do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator first read the letter?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a joint letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. It reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington,

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Because of the War and Navy Departments' strong interest in the work of the National War Labor Board, we are addressing this letter to you concerning the appropriation requested by the Board for the fiscal year 1945.

As you know, the effect of labor disputes on war production is a matter of deep concern to our departments. Industrial disputes have seriously threatened the production and distribution of items which are critically needed by the armed forces. The War Labor Board is the agency charged with the responsibility for the settlement of such disputes and its effective discharge of this responsibility is essential to the War and Navy Departments. Without its timely intervention, many difficult situations which have endangered war production in the past months could not have been solved. Moreover, it prevented the development of acute situations as well as settling them. In the absence of an effectively operating and adequately staffed War Labor Board in the coming year, the ability of the Army and Navy to procure materials vitally needed by its troops will be seriously jeopardized.

For these reasons, the War and Navy Departments are deeply concerned over the prospective inability of the War Labor Board to perform its important functions if it is forced to effect any reduction in personnel. Such a reduction is now threatened by the action of the House of Representatives and the Senate Appropriations Committee in reducing the appropriation requested by the Board for the fiscal year 1945. Its request merely provided for the maintenance of personnel at existing levels, but the House of Representatives and the Senate Appropriations Committee have taken action which would necessarily result in a substantial reduction in the Board's personnel. Even assuming that the present heavy work load of the Board does not increase, any such reduction would, in our opinion, make it impossible for the Board to keep up currently with its work. There are indications that the volume of this work will increase in the coming year.

Under these circumstances, the War Department and Navy Department urge that you take steps to secure a restoration of the amounts which have been cut from the Budget estimate for the War Labor Board for the fiscal year 1945.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.
JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall any details of the hearings on the appropriation for this agency, but the amount which was allowed by the Senate amendment which has been approved is exactly the amount of the appropriation this agency had for the present fiscal year.

So, unless there has been an increase in the salaries of the personnel employed in that agency, it should be adequate to maintain the agency at its present level.

Mr. BARKLEY. Evidently the amount approved by the House is below the Budget estimate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; it is below the Budget estimate, but not below the amount the agency has had for the present year. We restored the amount to exactly the amount it has had this year. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy say that will cause a reduction of personnel. I should like to know how that could be, unless the Board has greatly increased the salaries of its employees during the year.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall try to obtain that information by tomorrow, and I will ask that the vote on the committee amendment be reconsidered, if necessary, if I decide to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator would have to ask to have the Senate reconsider its action on the bill, also.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment would be to the pending bill, not to the one just passed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], also to provide a break-down of the figure, so as to show how the money would be spent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall try to obtain all the information about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is that the vote by which the amendment on page 14, under the heading "National War Labor Board," was agreed to, be reconsidered, so that the Senator from Kentucky may offer the amendment he desires to offer.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I am in favor of the bill as it is now written, before it is further amended. Will the Senator from Kentucky explain the parliamentary situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. The situation simply will be, if my request is granted, that the vote by which the Senate committee amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered, and the amendment will still remain as a committee amendment before the Senate. I merely wish to have an opportunity, if I find it desirable to do so after I obtain the facts, to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. If I do not offer an amendment to the committee amendment it will be adopted as it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on pages 2 and 3 there is a typographical error. As the bill now reads, the parenthesis begins after the word "hire", in line 22, page 2, and ends after the word "Statutes", in line 5, page 3. However, the parenthesis should end after the word "purchase", in line 23 on page 2. I ask that the correction be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Also, on page 3, in line 10, after the first word in that line, the word "not", the word "to" appears. That word should be stricken out, and I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of those passed over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the agreement previously entered into, the bill will go over until tomorrow. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral William S. Pye, United States Navy, when retired on July 1, 1944, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral, pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942; and

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended:

Richard E. Maulsby, from the 9th day of February 1942.

Alexander M. Hearn, from the 1st day of May 1942.

Frank H. Simonds, from the 18th day of July 1942.

Robert H. Barrow, a citizen of Louisiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943.

Earl F. Stanley, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:

Grover C. Williams, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.

Gerald G. Kirby, a citizen of Florida.

Charles E. Walker, a citizen of Illinois.

Raoul J. Archambault, a citizen of Rhode Island.

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive D, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, a protocol signed at London on February 7, 1944, for the United States of America, the Union of South Africa, the Commonwealth of Australia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, and Norway, amending in certain particulars the international agreement for the regulation of whaling signed at London on June 8, 1937, as amended by the protocol signed at London on June 24, 1938 (Executive Rept. No. 2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Arthur D. Fairbanks, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the District of Colorado. (Mr. Fairbanks is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 10, 1944.)

Bernard Fitch, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the District of Connecticut. (Mr. Fitch is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 16, 1944.)

Frank C. Blackford, of New York, to be United States marshal for the Western District of New York. (Mr. Blackford is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 24, 1944.)

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the District of Maine, vice John C. Utterback, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Commodore Andrew F. Carter, U. S. N. R., to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as executive, Army-Navy Petroleum Board.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

David S. Ward, Cuba, Ala., in place of Jack Vaughan, transferred.

David R. Wyatt, Eden, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ARKANSAS

Benjamin P. Davis, Altus, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Canda E. Smith, Lowell, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CALIFORNIA

Edward F. Schobert, Lathrop, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Fred B. Rossi, St. Helena, Calif., in place of Joseph Galewsky, retired.

Charles H. Elgar, San Gabriel, Calif., in place of L. C. Murphy, resigned.

FLORIDA

Alice W. Martin, Bay Pines, Fla., in place of L. F. Baxley, removed.

IDAHO

Lawrence A. Gillett, Declo, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jessie W. Wilson, Weippe, Idaho, in place of L. M. Pratt, removed.

ILLINOIS

Robert E. Ward, Chillumcothe, Ill., in place of W. T. McCanna, deceased.

Clarence H. Lindsay, Tilden, Ill., in place of George Lyons, resigned.

IOWA

Eugene J. Halligan, Davenport, Iowa, in place of H. J. McFarland, deceased.

Achsa F. Lookabill, Hastings, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Fae A. Deitchler, Silver City, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KANSAS

Ivan R. Cordill, Bern, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSISSIPPI

Archie Patterson, Pinola, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clara L. Wright, West Enterprise, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEBRASKA

Walter J. Baur, Dix, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Irving Rolston, Greenland, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Fred Gordon Lowden, Leesburg, N. J., in place of G. A. Fowler, resigned.

Catherine E. Kenny, Mountain Lakes, N. J., in place of P. B. Hanlon, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Bettie E. Jones, Corona, N. Mex., in place of R. L. Thomas, resigned.

NEW YORK

Mildred M. Jones, Hagaman, N. Y., in place of L. C. Vunk, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jessie L. Shipman, Horse Shoe, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Audrey Hoggard, Lewiston, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OHIO

Mary I. Timko, Barton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Homer T. Gates, Moscow, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Raymond E. Schryver, Warren, Ohio, in place of H. J. Dixon, deceased.

Harry R. Eastwood, West Richfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Florence A. Davis, Goltry, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marie Eden, Kinta, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rex T. Strickland, Madill, Okla., in place of R. T. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ida M. Duke, Ninnekah, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lellah V. Walker, Spavinaw, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OREGON

Fred O. Parsons, Hammond, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Isabella E. Lee, Jordan Valley, Oreg., in place of M. M. Anderson, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clarence R. Kring, Davidsville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Vernon M. Hatch, Forksville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gertrude M. Reed, Great Bend, Pa., in place of Carrie Stephens, retired.

John Stipanovich, Harwick, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carrie Walpusk, Jenners, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ralph W. Whipkey, Ohlerville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Pauline J. Ceryak, Tire Hill, Pa., in place of Mary Kauffman, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Anna F. Foy, Early Branch, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mattie H. Graham, Pomaria, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Iiah L. Scriver, South Shore, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TENNESSEE

Edith Caldwell, Lupton City, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amy E. Davis, Oakdale, Tenn., in place of L. N. Alley, deceased.

TEXAS

Hazel M. Ricks, De Kalb, Tex., in place of T. B. Lenox, deceased.

VERMONT

John E. Stewart, Morrisville, Vt., in place of J. E. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

James B. Blake, Sandston, Va., in place of E. P. White, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Velma P. Hix, Duvall, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Irvin G. Bowman, Petersburg, W. Va., in place of G. L. Smith, transferred.

Benjamin F. Hall, Thorpe, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Carl W. Janssen, De Pere, Wis., in place of J. S. McHugh, removed.

John J. Burkhard, Monroe, Wis., in place of J. J. Burkhard. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Esther D. Willson, Bigpine.

COLORADO

James D. Willson, Monte Vista.

Thomas H. Wand, Paonia.

KANSAS

Clarence G. Nevins, Dodge City.

J. S. Shilling, Junction City.

Helen Six, Lyons.

NEW YORK

Harold W. Becker, Catskill.
Ernest Rose, Central Valley.
Christena L. Sands, Hamden.
Graham Chapman, North Cohocton.
George P. Murphy, Roslyn Heights.
Frank C. Beams, Schenectady.
Stephen H. Keating, Waterford.

OKLAHOMA

Verdia Comer, Big Cabin.

TEXAS

Laura Harrison North, Riviera.
Robert L. Smith, Roaring Springs.
Levi E. Baker, Shallowater.
Clyde V. Welch, Somerville.

WASHINGTON

Allison C. Presson, Buena.

WYOMING

Fred B. Borne, Hulett.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1944

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord of life, as we contemplate Thy works, grant that our hearts may be in tune with nature and in harmony with Thy holy purpose. Speak to us and blend our words in full accord with the music of Thy love and in the strength of Thy wisdom, without which shivered and sunken would be the world in which we live. Thou who knowest our frame, open our spiritual vision that we may behold the marvelous resources which Thou hast prepared for us.

Be pleased to crowd us this day with self-respect, self-knowledge, and self-control which lead to power and influence. We pray for the urgency of a defiant faith from which the substance of a better world can be born—showing a God who is just and good. Help us to feel the warm flames of sympathetic co-operation, breathing the spirit of the Master, and interpreting His rule of conduct. We would remember that we are debtors to a great host of brave men who are serving us that there may be fewer shackles, less guilt and misery among fallen humanity. Do Thou encourage us to be brave and open-minded men and women, deserving the great honor which our Republic has bestowed upon us. At this Capitol shrine, we pray that we may reassert and renew our obligations, work and pray for the highest good. We lift our praise to Thee, O Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PROCESSING TAX ON COCONUT OIL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4837) to extend for an additional 2 years the suspension in part of the processing tax on coconut oil.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object since I am in favor of the bill. I believe, however, that an explanation of the bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be in order.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I shall be glad to make an explanation as well as I can. I may say in the first instance that this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Its passage was recommended and even requested by Mr. Crowley, of the Foreign Economic Administration, and Mr. Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration. It merely extends for an additional period of time the suspension of the processing tax on coconut oil. Originally a processing tax act was passed which gave a monopoly to the importation of coconut oil into this country from the Philippine Islands. Since we are unable to obtain any coconut oil from the Philippine Islands under the present military situation, there is no necessity for such an act any more. Two years ago a law was passed suspending that particular tax act, and this bill merely extends that suspension for an additional 2 years.

Mr. REED of New York. The fact is that, not being able to get this copra and coconut oil from the Philippine Islands, we are deprived of a source of glycerin, which is so essential to the war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. The extension of this act makes it possible for us to receive this essential source of war materials from sundry islands around the world where coconuts are grown.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is exactly the situation. Nearly all of this coconut oil is used directly for war purposes. In fact, the importation of it is under the control of the United States Commercial Company, which is an agency of the Federal Government.

Mr. REED of New York. Showing the importance of this, at the present time a great appeal is being made to the housewives to save all the grease possible and turn it in for the manufacture of glycerin.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. In the last World War squads of men had to go over the battlefields and collect everything that could be turned into glycerin. It is so essential that this bill should be passed without controversy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is a war measure and it is absolutely necessary. As the gentleman from New York has so well said, it should be passed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 2 of the act of September 16, 1942, entitled "An act to suspend in part the processing tax on coconut oil," is amended by striking out "June 30, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1946."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4070) "making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 67.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "newspapers and periodicals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "teletype news service (not exceeding \$900)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and not to exceed \$35,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "and including the temporary employment

(not exceeding \$30,000) of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 of the said amendment after the word "of", insert the words "more than four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "purchase of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 35, 57, 64, 65, and 66.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate remaining in disagreement to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8, relating to the Bureau of the Budget: Authorizes the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, instead of authorizing the use of \$500 for such purpose, as proposed by the House, and providing for the purchase of periodicals, only, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of not exceeding \$900 for teletype news service, instead of eliminating such service, as proposed by the Senate, and inserting such authority without specific limitation, as proposed by the House; makes \$35,000 available for temporary employment of persons or organizations without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, instead of \$55,000 for such purpose, as proposed by the House, and elimination of the authorization, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,000,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$1,830,400, as proposed by the Senate, and \$2,290,340, as proposed by the House; makes \$30,000 available for the employment of persons or organizations without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in connection with national defense appropriations, instead of \$65,000, as proposed by the House, and the elimination of such authorization, as proposed by the Senate; and limits the Bureau to the maintenance or establishment of not more than four regional, field, or other offices outside the District of Columbia, instead of prohibiting the use of any appropriations for such offices, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 14: Inserts the prohibition against the use of appropriations to the Civil Service Commission for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 29: Authorizes the purchase of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors, instead of purchase, repair, and cleaning of such uniforms, and the purchase of one passenger-carrying vehicle, in connection with public buildings and grounds outside the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, and the elimination of such authority, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 30: Appropriates \$10,581,000 for salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds outside the District of Columbia, under the Public Buildings Administration, as proposed by the House, instead of \$9,581,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Strikes out the language of the Senate, providing a direct appropriation and that revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority be deposited in the Treasury quarterly, and restores the language proposed by the House with reference to the expenditure of such revenues.

No. 67: Strikes out the provision of the Senate with reference to the payment of salary to any person filling any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person, and with reference to confirmation by the Senate of persons paid at the rate of \$4,500 or more per annum, and restores the provision of the House prohibiting the use of funds to pay any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve of such nomination.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendments reported in disagreement are as follows:

No. 35, relating to the release of funds heretofore appropriated to the Public Roads Administration but impounded or withheld from obligation: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 57, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 64, relating to the operation of Government-owned automobiles: The House managers will further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

No. 65, relating to the operation of Government-owned automobiles: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 66, relating to the operation of Government-owned automobiles: The House managers will further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is in effect a unanimous report, which has been submitted by your conferees. It disposes of all amendments which were in disagreement between the two Houses, and we had a total of 20 amendments in disagreement at the second conference. If the report and the subsequent motions on amendments in technical disagreement are acted upon favorably, it will dispose of

the independent offices appropriation bill as far as the House is concerned, and it will go to the President for approval slightly in excess of \$39,000,000 under the Budget estimates submitted to the Congress for consideration in connection with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: On page 29, after line 1, insert the following:

"All funds heretofore appropriated to the Public Roads Administration for the construction of roads but impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official are hereby released and made available for obligation or expenditure for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, and before the period, insert the following: "subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as to the availability of manpower and subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: On page 52, line 19, strike out "and accounted for as one fund to be known as the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund 1945', to remain available until June 30, 1945; and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944'" and insert in lieu thereof "general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and accounted for as one fund to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945, to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1944, and the Tennessee Valley Authority shall file reports every 4 months with the two Appropriations Committees of the Congress of all its receipts and expenditures."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment, if agreed to by the House, together with the action taken by the House in the report just adopted, will be that the so-called T. V. A. amendments of the Sen-

ate will be stricken from the bill; and in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill will be restored. The only change is the provision in the amendment just read, which requires that T. V. A. shall file with the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate every 4 months a complete statement of its receipts and expenditures.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that a unanimous agreement?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the unanimous agreement of the conferees.

Mr. RANKIN. That is on both sides of the House and the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 64: On page 64, lines 4 and 5, after "vehicle", insert "(1)."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 64.

Mr. Speaker, the next two motions which I shall offer make the insertion of an amendment at this point unnecessary, and it is a part of our agreement with the Senate conferees that the Senate will recede from its disagreement to this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 65: On page 66, line 2, insert "; (2) unless there shall be painted in white letters not less than 2 inches high on both sides of each motor vehicle and trailer owned or leased by the United States Government the words 'On Official Business,' and (3) unless there shall also be displayed at all times in a conspicuous place a sign designating the particular department, independent establishment, or other Federal agency which operates said vehicle. Any officer or employee of the Government who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be summarily removed from office, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 65 and concur in the same, with an amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will explain the situation to the gentleman if he will wait until the amendment is read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert a period and the following: "Any officer or employee of the Government who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be summarily removed from office."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the action recommended by the conferees I may say the effect of this amendment is to strike out the Senate language requiring the marking of motor vehicles or trailers owned or leased by the Government and to continue the House provision, adding to it an amendment providing the penalty of removal from office of any employee who uses or authorizes the use of any such vehicle for other than official purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 66: On page 66, line 21, add the following: "and clauses (2) and (3) shall not apply to motor vehicles operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the Secret Service of the Treasury Department."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 66.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the various motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the report and the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT JOHN J. ROONEY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

JUNE 15, 1944.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

Sir: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY as a

Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROONEY presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

INSURANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WALTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short address by a young lady at a commencement exercise.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the members of Local No. 21, United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPEECHES MADE IN THE LAST PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the merits of the political parties or their candidates in the coming Presidential contest, there is one piece of misrepresentation still being circulated by isolationists which ought to be eliminated from this campaign. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that next Tuesday, after the regular business of the House is disposed of, I may discuss for 15 minutes before the House every speech made in the last Presidential campaign about sending our boys to foreign wars and discuss the Democratic platform, and I hope to present a fair and honest and complete picture to the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon on the War Department appropriation bill and to include therein certain tables and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the country is confronted with a serious shortage of doctors. Death alone takes a toll of 4,000 each year. This does not include the casualties in action which are unknown. We face the appalling fact that the supply of doctors has been dangerously diminished and the situation is becoming alarmingly worse, and will continue so in the years to come unless we take immediate steps to remedy it.

The Selective Service Act of 1940 and its amendments make no provision for the deferment of premedical students. There are now over 6,000 students in medical schools in this country. If the draft continues to take over 3,300 of this number each year, this will leave about 2,700 to continue through school. Obviously, such a policy, if pursued, will imperil the health of the Nation. We cannot afford to run the risk of a flu epidemic such as in World War No. 1, which took more lives than were lost in battle.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill to amend section 5 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the deferment in each calendar year of not less than 6,000 medical and premedical students.

SHORTAGE OF MEN'S UNDERWEAR

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] has just called attention to a crisis which affects the whole country. I would like to call your attention to a crisis that affects one man in my congressional district. He is 6 feet 6 inches in height, weighs 260 pounds. He is affected because he cannot purchase underwear any place in the country. I received a letter from him this morning advising me that although he is not too big to buy war bonds, not too big to have served with distinction in the last World War, not too big to work diligently in a war plant and perform all the functions of citizenship, nevertheless due to a failure in our production set-up he finds himself unable to buy a suit of suitable underwear. He is faced with the crisis of being compelled to abandon underwear or to wear a mere loin cloth. To some this complaint may seem trivial when compared to other national and international problems. To the men of this country who are situated as is my friend, the problem is real and should command the immediate attention of the O. P. A. and W. P. B. I am wondering if there is any man in this House who can give me any information as to where I may go to find relief for this very deserving citizen?

Mr. MASON. Give him a pair of yours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PRATT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MRS. PHOEBE SHERMAN

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2354) for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman, a private bill, be restored to the private calendar. I have discussed the matter with both the majority and minority leaders and with the objectors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARTIN DIES

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Smear, Inc., headed by Walter Winchell is now frantically plugging a book just published entitled "Martin Dies" by William Gellerman. I have read this book which purports to deal objectively with the record of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and its chairman. The book is full of bias and prejudice as would be expected after examining the author's previous literary contribution.

In 1938, Mr. Gellerman wrote a book entitled "The American Legion as Educator." It was a vicious attack upon that great patriotic body and created indignation throughout the country at the time. In the conclusion of Mr. Gellerman's book attacking the American Legion on page 266 he wrote:

In the promotion of war and fascism in America, the American Legion has done more than its share.

Such a statement I am sure is resented by every true American and it should put everyone on notice as to the "job" he has attempted to do on a committee of this Congress through Gellerman's most recent book entitled "Martin Dies." I think it is likewise significant to note that Gellerman's book attacking the American Legion was sponsored by Prof. George S. Counts, who at that time was a member of the national executive committee of the Communist-front organization, known as the American League Against War and Fascism, whose vice president was none other than Mr. Earl Browder. This is only one of the many Communist affiliations of Professor Counts, the sponsor of Mr. Gellerman's book.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do this, Mr. Speaker, in order that we may obtain the program for the balance of the week. I understand there have been some changes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The War Department appropriation bill will be taken up. If that is disposed of so that other legislation may be considered today, immediately thereafter the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill will be taken up. If time is left, the conference report on the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill.

It is hoped that those matters will not take long. If there is any time left, it is the intention to bring up the rule making in order consideration of the war contract termination bill. Of course, that is on the program after we have disposed of other conference reports that are pending.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It might be possible to finish that war contract termination bill tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope so. In any event, if we dispose of all the conference reports that are pending, it will be the order of business tomorrow, and if not terminated, if final action is not taken by the House, then it will go over until Monday, because the deficiency appropriation bill is definitely assigned for Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will that deficiency appropriation bill take very long on Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. My best information is that it will take the greater part of the day. If it should go into the late afternoon I would not feel disposed to take up anything further, because the House has worked very hard and very effectively this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will go over until Monday then if it is not disposed of tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that would be better.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know anything about the status of the bill extending the life of the Civilian Pilot Training Act?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that expires on June 30.

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was called to my attention by my legislative clerk last night and I wrote a letter to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] asking him to discuss it with me, because action should be taken on that sometime next week. I am glad the gentleman brought it up, because I had that in mind. I do not know whether that can be passed by unanimous consent or not. If not, they will have to get a rule. It must be acted upon next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman state whether the WASP bill will be taken up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. That will be taken up next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FORMER CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I trust that when my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] discusses all of the campaign speeches in a day or two, he will have in mind and properly quote that speech in which the President said to the mothers of the Nation, quote:

And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

They are weeping over their let-down, and I trust the gentleman will quote the President properly at that time.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

A DANGEROUS SITUATION

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the country and the responsible administrative agencies of the Government a very important and very dangerous situation developing in this country.

For several years now many influences have been at work to make the white people and the colored people of this country, especially those in the Southern States, hate each other. And now, when that result has been accomplished to an alarming degree, it is being added to by a policy to force the people of these races to work together in close proximity, with every occasion and opportunity for individual irritation and conflict which easily could spread in this attitude as the flame of a match spreads in a dry prairie.

I do not suppose anybody in this country has any doubt as to what has been done to make these races antagonistic to each other, or the effect upon that antagonism of this policy to force them to work all mixed up with each other.

Recently one of the leading newspapers in my section of the country wanted a colored paper handler and advertised for such an employee. Why not, that was what they wanted? The local agent of F. E. P. C., however, served notice on the paper that it must not print such an advertisement, that it was discriminatory on account of color.

Yesterday I had a letter from a man who wrote me that it is being insisted that the F. E. P. C. clause be included in all rental contracts made by the Government, regardless of the character of activity.

The other day in Cleveland, so an Associated Press dispatch tells us, 7 colored people were sent under armed guard into a plant producing war mate-

rial where only white people were at work. Between 12,000 and 15,000 white people walked out. The fact that these colored people were sent in under armed guard shows the racial attitude there, and that it was anticipated by those who sent these colored people in that disorder and possible disruption of plant activity would result. The plant was paralyzed for 4 days. Six hundred strikers were discharged. They were told they would not receive certificates of availability unless they could show extenuating circumstances. The activities in the plant were renewed after this experience, but the deep-seated antagonism which resulted is there yet, liable to explode at any time and possibly a repetition of what happened in Detroit last year.

Of course, the situation is difficult at best, and dangerous at best, especially in the Southern States. It should be a sobering fact that the experiment which we are trying in this country of having two dissimilar races, each retaining its identity, live in large numbers in the same communities, has never succeeded in the history of the world. Considering how short a time in the life of a nation is the time which has intervened since the War between the States, our interracial adjustment, which the white people of the South have participated in—this improvement of the status of the colored people to which both races have contributed—better schools, better facilities, better opportunities, and the big fact that this all rests upon community approval and community interest, is perhaps the outstanding achievement of its kind of all time. This is all being imperiled by a combination of short-sighted outside interference, some doubtless well-meaning people, and by a well-organized, shrewdly directed, abundantly financed, communistic influence hungry for power, antagonistic to our form of government, and deeply resentful toward the white people of the South because their communistic, alien political philosophy has never been able to make any substantial headway.

INFANTRY DAY

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, today is Infantry Day. No unit or arm of our great military service is deserving of greater praise and recognition than G. I. Infantry Joe, nicknamed "Doughboy." He has been the backbone of every Army in every war in which this Nation of ours has been engaged, and today's global conflict is no exception. In Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Tarawa, Sicily, Anzio beachhead, Cassino, along all the beachheads in France on D-day, June 6, 1944, it was the infantryman, the foot soldier, who first landed on enemy soil and engaged in hand-to-hand combat.

This is no attempt to minimize the other arms of the service—the artillery and the mechanized forces, the Air

Corps. We all recognize the fact that the infantryman is supported magnificently by the other branches of the service, but the support is behind him and above him. There is nothing in front of him but the enemy. Yet nothing—not the raking artillery nor mortar fire of the enemy—stops him. In every war, including the present, the casualties in the infantry are always the highest. Nothing we can do would ever sufficiently repay him for his unsurpassed gallantry.

Ernie Pyle, famous war correspondent and 1944 Pulitzer prize winner, knows G. I. Infantry Joe better than many of the Army generals themselves because he has lived in dugouts and in foxholes with the American soldier boy since November 7, 1942, the day he set foot on new soil. Ernie suggested a combat pay bill, which I introduced in this Congress on March 8, 1944. My bill provides for an increase of 50 percent in pay when a soldier engages in actual combat. This is comparable to existing legislation passed by this wartime Congress on June 16, 1942, giving men in the Air Corps a 50 percent increase in pay when engaged in combat or when they engage regularly and frequently in aerial flights.

The Navy pays a 20 percent increase to men serving at sea and doing foreign duty. Personnel in submarine service is entitled to a further increase of 50 percent in pay while so attached.

Why not the same consideration for Infantryman G. I. Joe?

As one of the overseas doughboys wrote me:

It's not the money but the recognition, and I hope the war ends quickly so we can never collect a cent.

Another bill now being considered by the committee to give "expert infantrymen" and "combat infantrymen" badges will cost this Government more money than the provisions of my bill and will not meet the commendable recommendation made by Ernie Pyle which to me, to military men with whom I have spoken, and particularly to G. I. Joe himself, is the desired recognition.

Let us pay real tribute to Johnny Doughboy on Infantry Day by enacting into law the Ernie Pyle recommendation of: "Fight pay for fighting men."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein an interesting article which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein three short editorials on the message of the President on free ports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes

on tomorrow after the disposition of legislative business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SAUTHOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of the Electoral College.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two particulars and in one to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending the remarks I made in the House on day before yesterday I may include therein a short address I made some time ago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article from the Boston Globe written by James Morgan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Boston Globe entitled "New Tricks for an Old Dog."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SPEECHES—QUOTATIONS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward with a great deal of interest to the speech the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] intends to make on next Tuesday. I am certain he will quote correctly any speeches made by the President of the United States or the candidate who opposed him in the last election campaign.

I just want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] apparently quoting the remarks of the President attributed to the President this statement:

We will not send our boys overseas.

What the President said was:

We will not send our boys overseas except in case of attack.

That is what the President said, not the misrepresentation of a partial quotation. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows we were attacked at Pearl Harbor?

BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CLOTHING DIFFICULTIES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make an announcement to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. He raised a question here a while ago as to why his constituent, who is 6 feet 6 and weighs 260 pounds, could not buy a suit of underwear. There are some very definite reasons why mothers cannot purchase clothing of certain types for their babies in the cradles, and there are certain very definite reasons why this constituent cannot purchase that underwear, and if the gentleman from Wisconsin will call at my office, where I have the records, I shall be very glad to show him some of those specific reasons. We had a chance to clear some of them out of the way the last few days, but we failed to do so yesterday afternoon and our constituents are still without their underwear.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Did not the gentleman from Wisconsin vote against us on it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests: One to extend my own remarks; one to extend my own remarks and include an article from a Philadelphia paper; and the third to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, early this year I made the statement in a letter to a newspaper friend that Walter Winchell had been stripped of his uniform. Walter said that hurt him, and he said his feelings had been injured to the extent of \$250,000. He announced three or

four times over the radio or in the press that he had brought suit against me for a quarter of a million dollars. If he has brought suit, I have never heard of it officially or by any service of papers upon me, so his suit did not amount to much. But here is a warning to the membership. On April 12, 1944, Winchell announced:

Some gazettes read the libel action against the Congressman too fast.

We are suing because he allegedly told a Michigan newspaper that we were stripped of our naval uniform. This is to warn anybody: Don't print it or say it again outside of Congress or your strait jacket.

Walter warning against the use of free speech by anyone other than himself.

Now, the joke is that on February 19, a year before, one of Walter's pet papers, PM—of all papers—under the caption "Winchell put out of service," printed:

The Navy stripped Winchell of his lieutenant commander's uniform yesterday to appease the one-time isolationist bloc in Congress.

Walter, if he ever sues, had better get the right defendant. Let him sue PM; then before the court will be his friend—and two of a kind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4967) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I should like to have a suggestion from the gentleman from New Jersey as to time for general debate.

Mr. POWERS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we agree upon not to exceed 4 hours, the debate to be confined to the bill and equally divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself.

Mr. SNYDER. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, pending the motion, that debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, to be confined to the bill, and to be divided equally between myself and the gentleman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4967, the War Department appropriation bill, 1945, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill of which we are about to begin the consideration provides General Eisenhower with his knock-out punch of the Huns.

The first round started Tuesday morning, June 6. The day of the last round we just cannot predict, but we fervently hope that it will come before the Ides of March.

I should call this the Hitler doom bill, and the bill that will soften Tojo for his doom that shortly will follow.

It is the hope of our military leadership that Germany will be out of the war before another Easter time.

This bill contains the funds for the manpower and the material necessary to conduct offensives on a scale that could accomplish such an end, and it also contains the funds for a more prolonged action, should there arise situations which might occasion delays not presently anticipated. Wars just do not always run on preestablished schedules.

The bill presently before us does not permit us to be committed as much by twenty-five billions as did the bill of a year ago, but fortunately, of the bill of a year ago, present indications are that there will be left uncommitted \$33,672,971,000.

That money, this bill contemplates, shall be carried forward to help finance the 1945 fiscal-year load so that the amount of new cash we are proposing the appropriation of is \$15,436,031,795.

That amount of cash, plus the carry-over of unobligated 1944 money, will make available for new obligations \$49,109,002,795, which is broken down for you by general objects on page 4 of our report.

The proposed total is \$8,488,022,566 in excess of the estimated total of current fiscal year obligations, which may be a bit surprising.

That increase occurs principally under two heads:

1. Pay of the Army.—This bill contemplates a military force of 7,700,000 persons and the maintenance of that number throughout the year. We may expect that total number to be exceeded, because it represents effective personnel. When depletion occurs in the front-line areas there must be immediately available trained reserves to fill the gaps. That is the only way offensives may be aggressively conducted and the only way commanders may promptly follow up gains and continue to press the enemy.

Therefore, we must figure upon a full military pay-roll cost, at least. Other factors are the higher family-allowance rates and the larger number of officers and men who will be drawing pay for overseas service.

Pay is a big part of a military budget, or at least of an American military budget. It is responsible for about 25 percent of this bill.

It will interest you to know that \$1,872,000,000 of the pay figure represents the Government's contribution to family allowances. This is interesting, too: In the last war the soldier's base-pay rate was \$21 per month. We had the Army figure what the \$50 rate means to those

who otherwise would be drawing the former rate and the difference adds up to \$662,783,052.

So much for pay.

2. Ordinance.—The second and main item of increase applies to ordinance. As it has worked out, ordinance has had too much money in the past. Production facilities were overgaged, production output was undergaged, and consumption fell below the estimates. Production capacity increased through new methods and improved skill, with a consequent reduction in cost in which renegotiation had a large part. My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], can enlighten you on costs. He has devoted much time to the subject.

These general considerations will have yielded by the end of this month an unobligated balance of \$13,150,000,000 of prior ordinance funds.

This present fiscal year new ordinance commitments are not expected to exceed \$2,213,633,222. That is because of a resurvey of programed needs, presently being met by earlier long-range orders. In 1945 it will become necessary to increase new commitments to meet needs as best as they can be projected at this time. The bill makes available roundly six billion three hundred and eighty-five million more than the amount of current fiscal-year commitments, all to be charged to the unused 1944 availability and the remaining excess of such availability we propose to use to help defray the pay of the Army cost.

That accounts in the main for the difference proposed between new 1945 availability and 1944 obligations.

Some may think, in view of our experience this year with large unused balances that we should reduce this budget rather substantially. It is our judgment that would be a most unwise procedure in view of the war situation today. True, that argument was advanced a year ago and it has turned out that we gave them thirty-three and one-half billions too much, but we have recaptured every dime of it, and I think all of us would rather have pursued the course we did than to have had it said that our forces were handicapped because the Congress did not provide funds necessary to enable them to fight an aggressive war or possibly that our forces had met with reverses owing to inadequate munitions and properly equipped troops.

There was sound basis for our action a year ago. The present hearings are replete with justifications by our highest military leaders.

And I maintain there is sound basis today for providing for contingent factors, because the Lord only knows what tomorrow may bring forth.

I like the expression of Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. He stressed the fact before the Naval Subcommittee that the next 4 or 5 months of this war would be intensely critical and that until that time had passed there would be need to plan and provide for many contingencies. He said, and I quote:

We cannot be very precise on assumptions. We cannot assume that things will go ex-

actly as planned. We have to assume that things may not go well.

The Deputy Chief of the War Department General Staff, General McNarney, and we have right to be thankful that he holds that great and responsible position, told us frankly that if the Allied Nations were able to force the Germans out of the war before the end of the year, this bill very probably would contain too much money. I do not know who under heaven today can give assurances of such an eventuality.

All I want to say is that whether the Germans fold up or not, it is the plan of my subcommittee to bring the department people back before us in midyear and recanvass their budget. If we find any surplus money we can recapture it, and we did this year, and I want to pay my respects to the responsible officers in the War Department for the manner in which they have conserved the money which has been available to them this present year. We have in them and General Richards, the Budget Officer of the War Department General Staff, full faith and confidence.

We have managed to effect a number of reductions in this bill. They total \$241,837,905, and you will find that amount itemized, commencing on page 6 of our report.

I do not think we have done any hurt. We cannot do any real hurt, because they can appeal at any time.

Many items, you will see from the table commencing on page 16 of our report, we have not disturbed at all. That is true of all of the appropriations of the technical branches or the technical appropriations of such branches.

Aviation, of course, we have not touched. The new availability proposed is \$12,610,200,000, which is about 125 millions less than obligations the present fiscal year are estimated to total.

The amount for new airplanes, including spares, is \$8,859,565,925. That will provide 41,345 new planes nearly all of tactical types, or so denominated in the justifications.

Aviation is a tremendously costly component. Counting pay and technical equipment and ground facilities financed by other branches, approximately 42 percent of this bill is traceable to the air arm.

The bill includes under "Military posts" \$226,995,500 for the provision of facilities of various kinds, largely in continental United States. The general nature of the projects is shown on page 10 of the report. Aviation is responsible for the greater part of it, and a great part of that is owing to the increasing number of higher powered and heavier aircraft.

The committee has reduced the military post item by \$20,556,500, mostly off of the contingent fund.

We have kept the bill reasonably free of new legislative provisions. They are set out in the report commencing on page 14.

Briefly, the first one provides for relieving banks of responsibility for cashing allotment checks presented for payment without knowledge of the allottee

or the allottee's death. If such relief is not given, banks simply are not going to cash checks without assurance that the allottee is alive, and that would mean much delay and would occasion a flood of complaints by allottees.

The second is a familiar proposition. It pertains to educating doctors, dentists, and veterinarians. Putting a boy aspiring to be a doctor through the preliminary stages, through the college training, and through the internship means about 4 years and 3 months. Last year the committee proposed and the House approved Army participation in such training only as to students who could complete instruction in degree-granting institutions of learning within 2 years. The provision went out in the Senate and remained out. That recommendation of a year ago was made because of the remote chance of such students being of any value to the military in this war, and, therefore, it was according preferential treatment as to military service to a certain selected group. Another year has passed. New entrants into this training would not be available for service prior to the close of the calendar year 1948.

The instant proposal does not touch students presently in the program at any stage of the program, but it will stop any further inflow. I cannot say definitely how many individuals would be effected. The plans call for a man-year increase of 3,725 but some of that number quite likely are now in the program.

The third proposition relates to land acquisition. It requires that land be leased, if it should be possible and more economical so to do, rather than purchased, in those cases where doubt prevails that the land desired will be permanently needed, the intention being that determination shall vest in the Secretary of War.

The fourth proposal, relating to section 5 of the bill consist of 3 propositions:

First, Specifically makes appropriations available for administrative expenses in occupied areas. Such expenses are being incurred today, and this is merely to forestall any questions being raised as to the propriety of incurring such expenses.

Second, Sanctions the Army's part in occupied areas prior to release to U. N. R. R. A. The bill makes \$562,556,900 available for such employment, the expenditure objects being indicated on page 161 of the hearings. The discussion had the other day on the Foreign Economic Administration appropriation bill is fresh in our minds, and I see no need for further explanation.

The third clause permits the incurrence of expenses incident to investigations of one kind or another growing out of the Army's presence in foreign countries. Matters of compensation of foreign nationals, settlement of construction contracts, and subjects of that kind come up and there must be some investigation in order to arrive at mutually satisfactory settlements.

That disposes of the legislative provisions.

I wish to add that I have every reason to believe that the bill is satisfactory as to its textual content to the Committee on Military Affairs. I sent the distinguished chairman of that committee a copy of the original draft of the bill as soon as it was received from the printer and I understand he has been consulted by Colonel Moore, attached to General Richards' office.

The committee wants to cooperate with the legislative committee and is strongly averse to encroaching upon its prerogatives. If there has been any encroachment since the beginning of the war, it feels that there has been implied concurrence by such committee. Everything has been in the interest of facilitating performance of programs and policies which have legislative support and in directions, I am sure, which both committees and the Congress as a whole endorse.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the time of the committee to read it, but I shall include as a part of my remarks a statement showing by general objects, and by that I mean the same classification used on page 4 of our report, funds that have been available to the military establishment over the period June 30, 1940 to date. They include \$196,681,959 of funds that continued available that were available prior to June 30, 1940.

I have prepared the statement from data gotten up for me by the War Department.

I want to stress the fact that the statement includes all of the money reappropriated in this bill. As I previously have stated, we are reappropriating in this bill \$33,672,971,000 of prior appropriations. This bill carries new money totaling \$15,436,031,795, and that is all that may be appropriately added to the total of the statement I am inserting, and that total is \$185,951,185,221. The statement follows:

Pay and travel.....	\$22, 113, 285, 796
Subsistence.....	4, 881, 830, 860
Clothing and equipage.....	6, 865, 737, 992
General supplies.....	587, 373, 707
Army transportation.....	9, 512, 529, 080
Signal Corps.....	11, 153, 745, 565
Air Forces.....	60, 192, 083, 410
Medical Department.....	1, 663, 104, 189
Engineer service.....	16, 235, 940, 347
Ordnance Department.....	41, 632, 048, 625
Chemical Warfare Service.....	2, 088, 079, 832
Expediting production.....	6, 951, 804, 300
Special service schools, department expenses, and miscellaneous.....	2, 073, 621, 518
Total.....	185, 951, 185, 221

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude without expressing my keen personal regret that the country and the Congress and my subcommittee, particularly, will be deprived of the counsel and guidance of our beloved colleague the gentleman from Alabama, JOE STARNES, in shaping military budgets. He has sat next to me in drafting all of these war and pre-war measures and I have leaned heavily upon him because he is a tried and proven military man himself, and a lovable character besides.

JOE STARNES is a great American, a great patriot, and a staunch and loyal friend. I shall miss him and I know we

all shall miss him, and I wish to make this public acknowledgment of the great contribution this distinguished citizen and Member of the Congress has made to the success that has attended our Army in this great global war in which we are engaged.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to join the chairman of my subcommittee in the tribute he has paid to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] who has shown an unusual interest in and a great understanding of military problems by reason of his study and by reason of his actual military experience on the field of combat. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] served overseas in World War No. 1, receiving the Silver Star for exceptionally meritorious conduct in battle.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to hear these remarks with reference to the services of JOE STARNES. I think he knows and I should like to have the RECORD show that the Members on this side of the aisle from their association with JOE STARNES on this committee share the expressions of appreciation of Joe's services, of his patriotism, and of his alert and intelligent interest in all the things for the good of the War Department and the affairs of the country, which depend in such large measure upon the success of the military effort at this time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, just a few hours before General Marshall left for the other side a few days ago, he dictated the following in response to an inquiry I made of him:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1944.
Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on War
Department Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: In response to your request of June 6 for information as to what effect, if any, the landing in France and the proposed military operations in Europe, will have on our need for funds, I should like to call your attention to the testimony of Lieutenant General McNarney, Deputy Chief of Staff, before the subcommittee on May 9, 1944, in which he said:

"In England, United States and British troops are ready for the offensive which some of you have become impatient to see launched. Do not be disturbed, because I can assure you the operation has been carefully planned. Preparation will be thorough and execution will be by the most tried and expert leaders we could assemble.

"The estimates which we have submitted have been carefully worked out and represent our studied opinion of the funds necessary for our war effort.

"Let me make it clear that if our successes are greater than we have anticipated, the War Department will exercise all possible vigilance and return to the Treasury in the form of unused appropriations as great a sum as possible.

"On the other hand, if unforeseen difficulties and needs arise, our requirements will be increased materially and our estimates will prove inadequate. We have been con-

servatively optimistic in our forecasts, and I hope events will bear out our judgment."

General McNarney's statement represents my views. The estimates were drawn up in anticipation of a second front in Europe and represent our best judgment of the amount of money needed to successfully prosecute the war, not only in Europe but on the Pacific front as well.

Sincerely yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this subcommittee for 8 years. For 8 years I have served on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. When he leaves us this year only two Members will remain who were on the subcommittee when I became a member of it, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

During those 8 years the gentleman from Alabama, JOE STARNES, has worked hard and diligently. An examination of the hearings and of the RECORD during that period of time will show that there is no one either in or out of the Congress who has done more or contributed more toward preparedness, toward national defense, and toward the war effort, in a legislative way, than has the gentleman from Alabama, JOE STARNES.

No one can question the judgment of the electorate of any district, nor have I any desire to do so. We make history. The next generation will write that history. When that history is written, the historian of tomorrow, and of the next generation, will take care of the facts. He will write history as it is. A historian will have to record that the gentleman from Alabama, JOE STARNES, made an outstanding contribution to national defense and to the welfare of this Nation during the most critical times the Nation has gone through in several generations.

I want to pay my personal tribute to him. He has been on the other side of the aisle during that 8 years, but I have never seen a time when that subcommittee divided along political lines. You cannot sit across a table from a man 8 years, write bills, hold hearings, and go over controversial facts, without getting an estimate of the man's ability, of his patriotism, and of his sincerity.

And I base my statement upon that 8 years' experience during which I sat side by side with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] as a member of this subcommittee. I know that every Member of the minority feels as I do and expresses regret that he is leaving us at the end of this session. I sincerely hope that he will come back to us again and that I will be able to work with him once more.

Mr. Chairman, I have several matters I want to touch upon with regard to this bill. The chairman has made a very complete presentation of the facts. I do not want to duplicate or repeat what he has said. There are a number of in-

teresting items in this bill. One of these items is the Alaska Highway. The facts that I am about to state with reference to the Alaska Highway are taken from the testimony of Brig. Gen. I. D. Worsham, who has charge of the northwest division. The Alaska Highway is 1,400 miles long. It is a gravel road. The gravel was obtained in the vicinity and in the area in which the road was built. That road cost \$140,000,000, or \$100,000 per mile, for a gravel road. Those are the facts that are in the record. We will spend during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, \$7,780,320 for maintenance, or \$5,650 per mile for each of the 1,400 miles. In addition, the bill contains an item of \$4,000,000, or approximately \$2,850 per mile, for rebuilding bridges that may be washed out, for cleaning up, and for other jobs, making over \$8,400 per mile that we are going to spend on that road this year. This is not included in the initial cost of \$140,000,000.

One item in which I have been particularly interested in is the question of wages. I have always taken the position that men are entitled to wages commensurate with the services they render. I can see from my office window the Mellon Art Gallery. For months and months and months I watched that building rise from its foundations. It is a beautiful structure, a real temple of art, worthy of receiving the wonderful paintings which are now housed there. I marveled at the skill of the craftsmen who built that beautiful dome. I was fascinated with their work. I have always believed that the skilled craftsmen who fashioned that dome and who erected and perfected those beautiful columns are entitled to just as much credit and pay as is the architect who drew the designs.

The craftsmen who built that temple of art are entitled to wages commensurate with their services and the craftsmen who fashioned that beautiful dome are entitled to the same type of compensation as is the man who drew the plans upon the drafting board. But surely you and I can agree that the humble workman who sweeps the debris and broken stones with broom and shovel from the base of that monument is not entitled to the wages of the craftsman who fashioned that beautiful dome. I believe in good wages. I believe that wages should be determined by the type and class of services and the training of the men who render that service.

When I spoke to this House a year ago, after inspecting 47 defense plants, I read to the House advertisements regarding wages paid on the Alaska Highway. I read United States Employment Service advertisements for common labor stating that \$300 a month, lodging and board, would be paid. When this bill came before the House I asked General Worsham certain definite questions. For instance, I asked him how they could pay \$300 a month, room and board for common labor on that highway, since the Department of Labor had fixed the wage scale at \$1.10 per hour for common labor on the project. Rate for helpers was set at \$1.25 per hour; up to \$1.75 an hour for skilled labor.

General Worsham testified they had practically no common labor. Nearly everybody was paid as a helper at \$1.25 an hour or more. They guaranteed labor 240 hours' pay each month, which meant that a common laborer drawing helper's pay was paid \$320 a month and the skilled laborer up to \$420 a month. I asked General Worsham "If a man did not work a day, was he still paid his \$320 or \$420 a month?" His answer was, "Yes."

That is one of the reasons why the cost of the Alaska Highway was so high.

Mr. Chairman, who will pay for these excess costs? According to the Treasury Department, there are 21,600,000 individuals this year who will have incomes of \$1,000 a year or less or an aggregate income of \$19,200,000,000. This is an average of about \$900 a year. These 21,600,000 individuals, Mr. Chairman, are paying \$500,000,000 in taxes out of those incomes of \$1,000 or less. In that group of 21,600,000 there are 9,260,000 individuals who are heads of families. The Labor Department tells us that the average family consists of a man, a wife, a child of 13 and a child of 8. So we have 9,260,000 individuals in this group who are heads of families, trying to support 37,000,000 Americans on incomes of \$1,000 or less. They are paying taxes into the United States Treasury, out of which you must take the money to pay these people who are receiving \$320 a month for common labor.

We have 7,270,000 more heads of families who are trying to support some 29,000,000 people in family groups of four on incomes from \$1,000 to \$1,500. They are paying taxes. These people are helping to pay these excess wages.

A second matter I want to discuss is the Canol oil project. General Worsham also had charge of that. Much has been written about it in the papers. I do not want to restate the facts which other committees have given, but I am going to turn to some of the testimony that was given before our committee. The Canol oil project so far has cost us \$129,000,000. I asked for a break-down of that \$129,000,000, and here is the break-down:

First. Production of oil and exploratory work, \$14,240,000.

Second. Crude oil pipe line and pumping stations, \$50,635,000.

Third. Access roads, 521 miles, \$9,230,000.

Fourth. Refineries, \$24,980,000.

Fifth. Distribution pipe lines and pumping stations, \$30,315,000, making a total of \$129,400,000 that has been spent on that project. This does not include the \$16,000,000 we are spending to operate the plant during the coming year.

I have complete information as to production. We are paying 33 cents a barrel fixed-fee operating cost to the Standard Oil Co. of California. We are paying 20 cents a barrel royalty to the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, which I understand is a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. Part of that 20 cents a barrel is supposed to go to the Canadian Government, although the testimony was that the Canadian Government was not taking any royalty now.

The major part of the investment is going to be the property of the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada and the Canadian Government. The taxpayers are not going to be reimbursed one dime. They have agreed to sell us in the future 60,000,000 barrels of oil, 30,000,000 barrels from the present reservation and 30,000,000 from a reservation which may be developed in the future on as yet unproved ground. General Worsham testified our cost was \$15.90 a barrel for refined gasoline at the refinery. I read from the record:

Mr. ENGEL. How much would that be per barrel for the purpose of the record, General? General WORSHAM. \$15.9067.

Mr. SNYDER. How many gallons per barrel? A barrel does not mean anything.

General WORSHAM. That is 42 gallons.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. How does that compare with the price we pay for gasoline in this country?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. As I recall, it is about \$3 a barrel at the refinery in Michigan.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This \$15 per barrel, of course, involves no tax whatever?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is the cost, without any tax of any kind.

Let me quote. General Worsham said this:

If we can't sell the pipe line and the refinery, its disposition will later be determined by consultation between the two countries. The oil-field drilling equipment will go to Imperial Oil, and against that we have reserved in there the possibility of 30,000,000 to 60,000,000 barrels, and Imperial will pay for the equipment \$3,000,000 if we take 60,000,000 barrels.

The Imperial Oil Co. is very liberal. They are going to give us \$3,000,000 for the equipment that has cost us many times that amount, provided we buy 60,000,000 barrels of oil which is going to cost us \$15.90 a barrel. In other words, if we buy \$960,000,000 worth of oil from them, they are willing to pay us \$3,000,000 for the equipment. Again I quote:

Mr. ENGEL. We can buy from them 30,000,000 barrels of oil, which at the present time is costing us \$15.90 a barrel.

General WORSHAM. That is the cost of the manufactured, refined product.

Mr. ENGEL. And it would cost us \$15.90 per barrel for the refined product?

General WORSHAM. Yes, sir.

Of course, if labor cost comes down in the future, that cost may come down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I want to discuss next this \$34,000,000,000* which the War Department has kicked back into the Treasury.

Total amount available to the War Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, is \$74,284,368,809. They were able to spend \$40,611,436,809, leaving an unexpended balance as of June

30, 1944, of \$33,672,932,000. This is according to the statement of the Budget officer issued to me on May 5, 1944. It is my opinion that at least several billion dollars more will be found unexpended at the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. In other words, the War Department has kicked back into the United States Treasury an amount that almost equals the last two bond issues asked for by the United States Treasury Department.

The Air Corps break-down is perhaps typical. The Air Corps had available during 1944 \$23,735,000,000. Their obligations were \$12,735,000,000, leaving an unexpended balance of \$11,000,000,000. The following is a break-down of the amount turned back to the Treasury:

First. Reduction of the Army from a maximum strength of 8,200,000 men on which the estimates for 1944 were based, to 7,700,000, its present strength. This allowed a reduction in estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1944 of approximately \$2,066,767,000.

Second. Reduction in matériel requirements, \$18,504,325,000.

Third. Reduction in unit prices and savings through renegotiation, \$12,867,452,000.

Fourth. Savings on various miscellaneous items, \$234,427,000.

Total savings and kick-back to the Treasury, \$33,672,971,000.

When I speak about a reduction in unit cost I am not talking about a reduction in the cost of the manufacturer. I am talking about the difference between the unit cost which the War Department brought to the committee. For instance, the Air Corps told us in 1944, and the appropriation bill was based upon the assumption, that a B-27 Douglas bomber would cost us \$318,000. We made an appropriation for each bomber at \$318,000. This bill contains the same item at a cost of \$211,000, or a reduction of 34 percent.

A B-24 bomber, manufactured by Ford, was reduced from \$358,000 to \$219,000, or a reduction of 29 percent.

A B-26 bomber was reduced from \$206,000 in 1944 to \$152,000 in 1945, or 26 percent. A P-61 fighter was reduced from \$173,000 to \$145,000, or 17 percent; while a P-47 fighter was reduced from \$101,000 in 1944 to \$86,000 in 1945, or 16 percent.

In the transport field we find that the large Army aerial transport, C-54, was reduced from \$370,000 to \$265,000, or 28 percent; the C-46 was reduced from \$280,000 to \$217,000, or 23 percent; while the C-47 was reduced from \$116,000 to \$85,000, or 26 percent.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have the figures on the B-17?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. What are they?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The B-17 last year, 1944, cost \$318,000. It was reduced to \$211,000 in 1945, or a reduction of 34 percent.

I asked the War Department to set out in the record a complete statement

of comparison between last year's costs and this year's costs. I cannot describe the radio set in detail, but one radio set which last year cost us \$110,000 was reduced to \$52,998 in 1945. A second radio set which cost us \$44,000 in 1944 was reduced to \$15,000 in 1945, while a third set was reduced from \$23,800 to \$10,000.

The 105-millimeter howitzer M-7, that is the self-propelled mount, was dropped from \$88,700 to \$53,246; the M-1 rifle, the Garand rifle, was dropped from \$70 to \$35. The light armored car which cost \$25,000 in 1944 was reduced to \$19,000 in 1945. Medium tanks cost us \$84,000 in 1944 and now cost us \$58,000. A splendid job has been done in this field, and it is very encouraging.

Now I want to discuss Army transport pay. The Army is not responsible for fixing the pay of the Army transport's civilian employees. I quote as follows:

Mr. POWERS. You have no control over the amount of the bonus or the rate that is paid?

General GROSS. I have been directed to accept the War Emergency Board pay scale.

Mr. ENGEL. What is the W. S. A.?

General GROSS. The War Shipping Administration.

Mr. POWERS. All you do is obey an order that comes to you?

General GROSS. Yes. We paid less originally, but now we meet the pay scales set by the W. S. A.

Mr. SNYDER. You paid less before?

General GROSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. Do they get their subsistence in addition to their wages?

General GROSS. The men aboard ship do.

Mr. ENGEL. In other words, this overtime and bonus shown on page 624, amounting to 103 percent of their wages, does not include subsistence which they get in addition thereto; is that right?

General GROSS. That is correct.

Again I asked:

What is the average bonus?

General GROSS. That depends on the number of days actually at sea. In the Atlantic or the Pacific he gets 100 percent of his daily rate as a bonus.

Lt. Gen. Omar Bradley, who is commanding the offensive right now in the invasion of Europe, is paid \$10,451 a year; General Marshall receives \$11,951, which is also the pay of Admiral King, so I am informed. I asked General GROSS to give me specific information on Army transport pay. I asked for the three highest and the three lowest paid men in each group from masters down to ordinary seamen. They receive base pay, bonus for overtime, subsistence, and quarters. I am inserting this information at the conclusion of my remarks in the Record. The first of the three highest masters or captains was paid a base pay of \$5,691.04, bonus of \$4,628.55, subsistence and quarters, \$540; total gross pay—base pay, bonus, subsistence and quarters—\$10,859.59. The man got approximately \$408 more for being captain of that little ship than Omar Bradley gets for leading the invasion in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The second man received a base pay of \$5,485.96, bonus \$4,763, subsistence and quarters \$540—total gross pay \$10,789.51, or approximately \$330 more than Omar Bradley gets. The next man got \$5,486 base pay, \$4,531 bonus, \$540 subsistence and quarters—total, \$10,557. I shall from now on give the gross pay only. The three lowest paid men in this class received \$9,789, \$9,780, and \$9,445. All the others were paid between \$9,445 and \$10,859 a year.

Let us take next the ship's three highest paid first officers. They received \$7,401, \$7,056, and \$6,929 a year. The three lowest received \$6,340, \$4,476, and \$3,762.

Chief engineers: The three highest received \$9,688, \$9,678, and \$9,466. The three lowest chief engineers received \$9,246, \$8,930, and \$8,893.

Chief stewards: The three highest received \$7,399, \$6,924, and \$6,827, while the three lowest received \$6,286, \$6,014, and \$5,879.

Chief cooks: The highest got \$5,182, the next \$4,998, and the third \$4,835. The three lowest received \$4,826, \$4,793, and \$4,363. In each one of these cases the bonus and overtime amounted to as much or more than the base pay.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. When they get up into the \$6,000 bracket they cease to be cooks and become chefs.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. But they are still called cooks on the pay roll.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman referring to American transports?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am referring to American Army transports operated by the United States Army with civilian employees.

Mr. STEFAN. Operated by American skippers?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's investigation did he look into the matter of British transports which haul American troops overseas?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No; I did not.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there anything in this bill providing funds for the payment of Great Britain for the transporting of our troops overseas?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I did not go into that.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know how much we are charged per man transported on those ships?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder if it is the gentleman's opinion that it

might be possible to correct this situation by putting these masters, stewards, and carpenters in uniform?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I asked General Gross about that and you will find in the record a statement as follows:

Mr. ENGEL. Why could we not operate Army transports the same way as the Navy operates their ships, with enlisted personnel? These are all young, able men, are they not?

General Gross. That is a practical question.

Mr. ENGEL. A good many of these seamen are within the draft age, are they not?

General Gross. Yes, some of them are, some of them are not.

Mr. ENGEL. A good many of these able seamen are under 38 years of age, are they not?

General Gross. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLE of New York. The witness did not explain the reason these people could not be put in uniform?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. He did not.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman have any opinion as to the reason that could not be done?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the Navy can do it, why not the Army?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think they can do it.

In reference to the able-bodied seamen, their base pay starts at \$1,100 to \$1,200 a year. It should be understood, in addition, that these men do not benefit from veterans' legislation such as we passed last week. I am going to put in the Record the pay of 12 able seamen, which is typical, and the pay of 12 or 13 ordinary seamen. This statement shows the base pay, overtime, subsistence, and quarters. I will give the pay they actually drew for a short period of time, less than 1 year, and project that into the full year. I can understand why the man who is married and has a family and who is drawing \$1,200 a year base pay wants an extra bonus for going into the war zone when he is not covered by veterans' legislation.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be said for the ordinary seaman and the able-bodied seaman, the master of an Army transport is not entitled to the pay of an admiral of the Navy or a lieutenant general of the Army.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman advise us who determines what bonuses are to be paid?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is determined by the War Shipping Board. The testimony is that the War Shipping Board tells the War Department what it has to pay.

Mr. COLE of New York. The War Department has nothing to do with it?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The War Department has nothing to say about what it pays. This is in no way a criticism of the War Department. The transportation service pays what it is told to pay, according to the testimony that was given in the hearings. I shall put the complete report in the Record for the information of the House.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following tables showing the pay of the civilian officers and men on Army transport service.

MASTERS—3 HIGHEST

Name	Base pay	Overtime	Bonus	Subsistence and quarters	Gross
1.	\$5,691.04	-----	\$4,628.55	\$540.00	\$10,869.59
2.	5,485.96	-----	4,763.55	540.00	10,789.51
3.	5,486.01	-----	4,531.39	540.00	10,557.40

MASTERS—3 LOWEST

1.	\$5,485.98	-----	\$3,763.05	\$540.00	\$9,789.03
2.	5,485.92	-----	3,674.67	540.00	9,700.59
3.	5,485.93	-----	3,419.20	540.00	9,445.13

FIRST OFFICERS—3 HIGHEST

1.	\$3,403.96	\$331.20	\$3,126.13	\$540.00	\$7,401.29
2.	3,198.96	647.45	2,670.54	540.00	7,056.95
3.	3,198.96	336.91	2,853.27	540.00	6,929.14

FIRST OFFICERS—3 LOWEST

Name	Base pay	Overtime	Bonus
1. From May 1, 1943, to Apr. 30, 1944.....	\$3,198.96	\$296.13	\$2,304.92
2. From Jan. 16, 1943, to Jan. 15, 1944.....	3,198.96	731.40	-----
3.	3,198.96	17.25	5.92

Name	Subsistence and quarters	Gross
1. From May 1, 1943, to Apr. 30, 1944.....	\$540.00	\$6,340.01
2. From Jan. 16, 1943, to Jan. 15, 1944.....	540.00	4,470.36
3.	540.00	3,762.13

CHIEF ENGINEERS—3 HIGHEST

Name	Base pay	Overtime	Bonus	Subsistence and quarters	Gross
1.	\$5,160.04	-----	\$3,988.30	\$540.00	\$9,688.34
2.	4,955.04	-----	4,183.29	540.00	9,678.33
3.	4,955.04	-----	3,971.00	540.00	9,466.04

CHIEF ENGINEERS—3 LOWEST

1.	\$4,955.04	-----	\$3,751.77	\$540.00	\$9,246.81
2.	4,955.04	-----	3,435.58	540.00	8,930.62
3.	4,955.04	-----	3,398.84	540.00	8,893.88

CHIEF STEWARDS—3 HIGHEST

1.	\$3,184.00	\$658.95	\$3,016.69	\$540.00	\$7,399.64
2.	2,979.03	517.50	2,887.90	540.00	6,924.43
3.	2,979.08	351.32	2,957.39	540.00	6,827.79

CHIEF STEWARDS—3 LOWEST

1.	\$2,979.12	\$338.10	\$2,429.72	\$540.00	\$6,286.94
2.	2,979.09	164.45	2,331.22	540.00	6,014.76
3.	2,979.12	237.48	2,122.42	540.00	5,879.02

CHIEF COOKS—3 HIGHEST

1.	\$2,290.00	\$370.18	\$2,370.67	\$252.00	\$5,182.85
2.	2,190.00	443.70	2,112.83	252.00	4,998.53
3.	2,190.00	171.69	2,262.25	252.00	4,875.94

CHIEF COOKS—3 LOWEST

1.	\$2,190.00	\$334.05	\$2,050.82	\$252.00	\$4,826.87
2.	2,190.00	364.23	1,986.94	252.00	4,793.17
3.	2,190.00	192.10	1,730.50	250.40	4,363.00

ABLE-BODIED SEAMEN

Name	Base pay	Overtime	Bonus	Subsistence and quarters	Gross
1. Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1943, projected for full year.....	\$1,175.00	\$230.78	\$1,448.33	\$162.40	\$3,016.51
2. Aug. 10 to Dec. 31, 1943.....	470.00	84.17	431.66	98.70	1,084.53
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	211.70	1,098.65	252.00	2,762.35
3. Mar. 26 to Nov. 30, 1943.....	816.67	82.02	941.13	171.50	2,011.32
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	116.80	1,376.05	252.00	2,944.85
4. Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1943, projected for full year.....	1,200.00	105.82	1,363.32	252.00	2,921.14
5. July 12 to Dec. 31, 1943.....	568.33	39.53	514.99	118.30	1,236.15
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	79.64	1,091.35	252.00	2,622.92
6. Jan. 1 to Oct. 31, 1943.....	1,000.00	98.17	1,101.38	210.00	2,409.55
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	88.17	1,321.30	252.00	2,871.47
7. Apr. 23 to Aug. 21, 1943.....	396.67	37.40	446.67	83.30	664.04
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	37.40	445.20	252.00	1,934.70
8. Jan. 1 to July 24, 1943.....	680.00	48.47	1,293.54	142.80	2,164.61
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	48.47	2,299.50	252.00	3,799.97
9. Jan. 1 to Apr. 15, 1943.....	350.00	28.89	678.53	73.50	1,030.72
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	28.89	2,007.50	252.00	3,488.39
10. Jan. 4 to Nov. 22, 1943.....	1,063.33	82.06	1,425.67	223.30	2,794.36
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	82.06	1,613.30	252.00	3,147.36
11. Jan. 6 to Aug. 8, 1943.....	710.00	67.60	736.68	149.10	1,663.38
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	67.60	1,255.60	252.00	2,775.20
12. May 1 to Nov. 30, 1943.....	700.00	78.62	1,011.13	147.00	1,936.75
Projected for full year.....	1,200.00	147.00	1,722.80	252.00	3,321.80

ORDINARY SEAMEN

1. Mar. 30 to June 8, 1943.....	\$189.75	\$22.53	\$203.33	\$43.40	\$459.01
Projected for full year.....	990.00	116.80	1,058.50	252.00	2,417.30
2. Feb. 26 to Sept. 27, 1943.....	583.00	57.83	901.68	148.40	1,690.91
Projected for full year.....	990.00	98.55	1,543.95	252.00	2,884.50
3. Aug. 19 to Nov. 30, 1943.....	247.50	22.53	235.00	71.40	576.43
Projected for full year.....	990.00	76.65	832.20	252.00	2,150.85
4. Jan. 4 to July 26, 1943.....	510.30	56.08	1,128.34	142.10	1,836.82
Projected for full year.....	990.00	98.55	2,292.20	252.00	3,632.75
5. Mar. 16 to Aug. 8, 1943.....	374.00	40.81	475.01	100.10	989.92
Projected for full year.....	990.00	102.20	1,193.55	252.00	2,537.75
6. Jan. 28 to June 30, 1943.....	420.75	87.56	303.97	98.70	910.98
Projected for full year.....	990.00	204.40	719.05	252.00	2,165.45
7. May 19 to Nov. 30, 1943.....	528.00	82.45	981.16	134.40	1,726.00
Projected for full year.....	990.00	153.30	1,835.95	252.00	3,231.25
8. Feb. 18 to Oct. 6, 1943.....	834.75	83.31	1,077.05	160.30	2,155.41
Projected for full year.....	990.00	153.30	1,981.95	252.00	3,377.25
9. Mar. 22 to Aug. 16, 1943.....	373.75	60.78	431.67	95.90	1,008.77
Projected for full year.....	990.00	149.65	1,069.45	252.00	2,461.10
10. Apr. 21 to Oct. 31, 1943.....	522.50	152.41	95.00	133.00	902.91
Projected for full year.....	990.00	284.70	178.85	252.00	1,705.55
11. Jan. 25 to Nov. 18, 1943.....	797.50	75.67	1,035.01	203.00	2,111.18
Projected for full year.....	990.00	91.25	1,270.20	252.00	2,603.45
12. May 19 to Nov. 25, 1943.....	514.25	40.37	964.41	130.90	1,640.93
Projected for full year.....	990.00	76.65	1,850.55	252.00	3,169.20

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this is the last time the gentleman from Alabama will speak on a War Department fiscal bill for at least 2 years. I want to say to the gentleman and I want to say to the membership of the House that we of the War Department Appropriations Committee have appreciated his service, we have appreciated his ability and we have appreciated the man, JOE STARNES, as a member of our committee during these past 10 years. Joe, we are sorry you are leaving, we are going to miss you and we hope you will return in 2 years.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for the gracious words of commendation by my colleagues with whom I have served during the past 8 years on this subcommittee. I have enjoyed my experiences on the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations more than any other experience I have had as a Member of the Congress. I have had a deep and abiding interest in national security all my life.

Let me pay my humble tribute to the members of the committee with whom I have worked during the past 8 years. They have never exhibited any show of selfishness or partisanship at any time. These men are consecrated men, earnest, and diligent in the pursuance of their duties, anxious, ready and willing to provide ample security for their Nation in war and in peace. To them I pay my tribute and to them the American people owe a debt of everlasting gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, our consideration today is directed to the Military Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1945. At about this same time last year I had the privilege of outlining to you the War Department program for fiscal year 1944, and presenting a rather comprehensive picture of the accomplishments of this great Army of ours since the beginning of the emergency period.

STRATEGICAL PICTURE

In the past year the strategical picture has altered sharply and very much in our favor. Early June of 1943 we redeemed the Continent of Africa. Something more than the recovery of territory was implicit in that victory. American soldiers had been given their first great test against the formidable military machine of Hitler. They proved their courage and that American weapons, forged by American workmen, were the equal and in many cases the superior of anything the Germans had been able to create.

After the victory in Tunisia our north-African forces stood poised for their first attack on fortress Europe. The epic invasion of Sicily took place in early July, and in 35 days the Nazis and Mussolini's Fascist legions were defeated and re-

tired to the Italian boot. The fall of Mussolini followed soon after, and Italy faded from the war as an enemy.

The Germans showed the most stubborn determination to defend the Italian homeland from our attacks. The Salerno landings were fiercely resisted, and although Naples soon fell to our arms, our progress toward Rome was delayed through the long months of winter.

Germany is beginning to feel the full might of the nations she has sought to destroy. Victorious Allied forces are pressing her hard in Italy. In Russia the mighty Red Army has rolled back the invader in the south, in the center, and in the north, and appears poised for another great onslaught. In the European theater the pressure which has been steadily growing against the Nazis has been finally unleashed. The length of time that will be required to achieve full victory is still a matter of conjecture, but there is no doubt as to its eventual accomplishment. For months vast fleets of American and R. A. F. planes have cruised the skies, bringing destruction to German industry, communications, and fortifications. Preparedness has been thorough; accomplishment will be equally complete and final. The armies of liberation are on the march to redeem the Continent of Europe.

In the Pacific the year has seen the beginning of our offensive against Japan. It has begun auspiciously and has already wrenched from the hands of the Nipponese many of the island conquests which they had overrun in the first 6 months following their attack on Pearl Harbor.

A year ago Guadalcanal and Papua in New Guinea were the only territories we had recovered. In a series of impressive victories since last August we have taken back the Solomons and most of New Guinea. We have taken island bases off New Guinea which now place the Philippines within reach of our bombers. We have redeemed much of New Britain and the islands which flank it. We have driven the Japs from the Gilberts and the Marshalls.

On the Pacific mainland, our first thrusts have already been made in the rugged terrain of Burma and in the north and east of that great state our Chinese allies are pushing back a Japanese expeditionary force. Yes, Japan is feeling the pressure, too. Her island naval bases of Truk and Ponape have been mercilessly pounded. Above her homeland, the Kuriles have been attacked again and again. On the other hand, the Chinese situation is giving some cause for genuine apprehension at this time. The Japanese are making their fifth attempt to take Changsha and the Chinese-held portion of the Hankow-Canton railroad. One of our main air bases in that area is at Hengyang, on the Hankow-Canton line. Should this attempt by the Japanese be successful and they take Hengyang, our airmen would be forced farther back into China's interior. The adverse effects on our strategic operations in that area are obvious. Changsha and Hengyang must, therefore, be held if at all possible.

This brief summary of the situation is in the nature of a report on the way in which appropriations of past years have prepared the way for the great assaults which will be necessary in the coming year to crush our foes across the oceans. A stupendous task has been accomplished. All the industrial might of America has been mobilized to forge the weapons and the equipment and the ships to carry an Army and its needs thousands of miles to the points of contact. Matériel in superior quality and overwhelming quantity has been provided. We are on the offensive on all fronts; the complete mobilization of our Army has been accomplished; we now have the best trained and best equipped Army which has ever honored our country on the battlefield.

In the forthcoming liberation of Europe, we can be assured that our military leaders have brought our forces to the highest peak of efficiency; that they are provided with the finest arms which any military force has ever carried; and that for those who become battle casualties there will be waiting the finest medical care and treatment which it is possible to provide. We can be sure that everything humanly possible has been done in the first place to make our effort successful, and in the second place, to get it over with as quickly as possible with the minimum losses in men and matériel. That is the picture today.

FUND REQUIREMENTS

The money we will appropriate today is for the maintenance and continued supply of the tools which we have already provided our Army to fight on the battlefield. The initial equipping is accomplished. For fiscal year 1945, \$15,436,031,795 has been requested by the War Department as a new appropriation. Together with the reappropriation of \$33,672,971,000 which it is estimated will be unobligated on June 30, 1944, making together a grand total of \$49,109,002,795, this will finance the Army's operations during fiscal year 1945.

This budget is one-third less than the funds made available to the War Department during each of the last 3 fiscal years. Perhaps a review of the appropriations since the beginning of the emergency period would be beneficial in analyzing the present financial situation of the War Department. From an appropriation of \$651,222,193 for fiscal year 1939, the appropriations reach a peak of \$75,462,593,587 in fiscal year 1942, a tremendous increase from the \$8,480,594,407 appropriated for fiscal year 1941. For fiscal years 1943 and 1944, the appropriations were only slightly under that for fiscal year 1942. Thus this is the first year that the Army has been able to lower substantially its request for funds below the peak years of 1942, 1943, and 1944. These huge sums were provided so that our military leaders would have the flexibility essential for their planning. They had to overcome the initial advantages of our enemies and to reach as rapidly as possible the stage of complete mobilization at which we now find ourselves. It is to their everlasting credit that they

have been able, through skillful and intelligent management, to do the job with considerably less expenditure of public funds than they had estimated and that the confidence of this Congress had made available to them.

In fiscal year 1942, we made available to the War Department \$75,462,593,587 by an original and six supplemental appropriation acts during the year. Only \$43,353,036,710 of this amount was actually obligated by the War Department during that year, leaving \$32,109,556,877 to be reappropriated against the \$74,929,563,242 estimated and made available for fiscal year 1943. Of the 1943 total \$59,753,152,954 was obligated during that fiscal year, leaving \$15,176,410,288 to be applied against the requirements of fiscal year 1944. It now appears that though we made available to the War Department \$74,211,249,961 for use during fiscal year 1944, they will obligate only a net \$40,538,378,961 of this amount, leaving to be applied against next year's requirements an estimated \$33,672,971,000.

The two largest unobligated balances of funds occurred in fiscal years 1942 and 1944. The reasons are readily explainable. It was in fiscal year 1942 that we were abruptly and definitely thrust into this world conflict. At that time our armed forces barely provided a foundation on which to build the mighty war machine that we were going to need to prevent aggressors from landing on our shores and destroying our democracy. Too much cannot be said for the untiring and brilliant efforts of our military and industrial leaders when called upon overnight, as it were, to build our armed forces to a strength which could cope with the military machines built up by our enemies over many years. How far and how fast we could go at that time was very uncertain. We had to get as much as we could as fast as we could. As a result, this Congress made available to the War Department substantially all the funds requested. It was the War Department's job to place the necessary contracts with industry and start huge quantities of many thousands of items rolling off the assembly lines. All the funds made available through the supplemental appropriations were not obligated before the beginning of the new fiscal year. But we had put the whole world on notice that the American people were willing to back up our armed forces 100 percent.

The fiscal year 1944 estimates contemplated an Army of 8,200,000 men. Shortly after the beginning of the fiscal year strategic commitments permitted a reduction to a maximum of 7,700,000. This change in itself allowed a decided reduction in our total requirements for maintenance and operation. During the early part of fiscal year 1944, the effects of prior planning began to appear and requirements began to stabilize. Actual expenditure rates of men and matériel were reflected in revised estimates of requirements, stock levels were lowered, and reductions in prices through the processes of renegotiation and voluntary action on the part of manufacturers, were realized. Moreover, the near com-

pletion of the industrial mobilization of our country eliminated the need for the large reserves which up to that time had been felt necessary. Thus a large reduction in our over-all requirements became possible.

For these reasons we come to you today and say that while the War Department estimates its fund requirements for fiscal year 1945 at \$49,000,000,000, it will only be necessary to appropriate \$15,400,000,000 in new funds. The remainder will be taken care of by reappropriating \$33,600,000,000 saved during last year.

PERSONNEL AND THE SUPPLY PROBLEM

The end of 2½ years of war finds our Army deployed in theaters of operations from the South and Southwest Pacific to the Aleutians; from Russia through Italy and north Africa to the United Kingdom; and from China, Burma, and India to Iran. There are over 3,650,000 soldiers now outside the continental United States. The strength overseas exceeds by more than 1,500,000, the peak overseas strength of the Army in World War No. 1, and is only 400,000 men short of equaling the entire strength of the Army at the close of World War No. 1. One year ago, only 1,460,000 were overseas, indicating the speed of our deployment. By the end of 1944, it is anticipated that more than 5,000,000 men, approximately two-thirds of the total strength of the Army, will be overseas.

It is almost impossible to visualize the military requirements for an Army of the present strength. A look at the way a modern army consumes its matériel, however, indicates the great requirements which will be satisfied by the appropriation bill. In 1 day's bombing attack on Bremen and Vegesack, for example, our planes dropped 2,500,000 pounds of bombs, fired 2,675,000 rounds of ammunition, and consumed 1,000,000 gallons of gasoline. Multiply this by the number of sorties flown by the Army Air Forces each day of the year and the magnitude of just this one phase of the total supply problem will be apparent. Also, consider the fact that one armored division uses more than 600 tons of ammunition and 78,000 pounds of food every day it is in action. During the last 48 days of the Tunisian campaign, 38,000,000 rounds of ammunition were fired by the Allied troops. Even during our most successful actions, the loss of weapons and supplies is terrific. Consider these figures, in connection with our whole Army on a great offensive, and you can well understand the task faced by our logistics planners and American industry. While the military campaigns and our production records have permitted many cut-backs in individual items, the total requirements show no decrease. Even a sketchy review indicates a growing demand for material.

THE ARMY AIR FORCES

Today, the United States Army Air Forces with slightly less than one-half of its total personnel of approximately 2,350,000 already overseas, has a total of more than 75,000 airplanes of all types, of which approximately 34,000 are combat type. Now, well committed over-

seas, it is the world's most formidable aerial striking force. In addition to building and maintaining this gigantic combat force, American industry has constructed many thousands of planes for our allies.

Quality is, more than ever, the prime consideration. All efforts are being concentrated on increasing production of the models which have proven themselves best in combat. Our airmen must have the best weapons which it is possible to provide. New methods of defense are continually being used against us. The airplanes with which we started this war would be annihilated should we attempt to use them at this time in our active theaters. The increase in defensive measures and offensive power has been tremendous.

While, as far as size goes, the Army Air Force has largely matured, their offensive activities are speedily reaching new peaks. Over 300,000 sorties were flown against the enemy in the first 4 months of this year, and over 200,000 tons of bombs were dropped on his war industries, lines of communications, airfields, fortifications, troops, and shipping. These figures equal or exceed the effort of the whole year of 1943, and are over 10 times that of the whole year of 1942. The month of May has established still further records as the air preparations for the liberation daily increased in ferocity.

Air superiority has been achieved in every war theater and is rapidly being made more decisive. Over 11,000 enemy airplanes were destroyed in 1943 and over 7,000 during the first 4 months of this year. The enemy air reaction to our bombing in every theater is decreasing. We now, more than ever, have to go down and destroy on the ground, planes which have been unwilling or unable to come up and fight in the air. Our enemies, however, are resourceful and tenacious. Only by continuing our utmost efforts can we assure ourselves that the quantitative and qualitative preponderance which has been so abundantly proved will be maintained until the last hostile war plant has been sent back to the girders or brick and mortar from which it was built, and the last enemy plane has been destroyed in the air or on the ground.

A discussion of the Army Air Forces would not be complete without a statement concerning its Air Transport Command, which had its origin May 28, 1941. This command has just celebrated its third anniversary and some of its accomplishments during that period are interesting to note. The Air Transport Command has become the largest air transport and ferrying system in the world, carrying key personnel and vital matériel to all theaters of war and bringing back strategic materials badly needed for war production. During April 1944 it flew 29,000,000 miles in the ferrying of military craft. During March 1944 it flew 20,000,000 miles in transport service—most of which was abroad. During March 1944, nearly 60,000 persons were flown to destinations abroad. Regular air routes in the

United States and abroad total 135,000 miles—more than five times around the globe. Although the Air Transport Command originally was charged with delivery of military aircraft to countries fighting for democracy, new responsibilities have been added, until today it is performing such tasks as: Transporting troops to forward bases; moving a complete field hospital to Alaska in 36 hours; flying supplies over the Hump to China; evacuating wounded from overseas to the United States; transporting bombs and ammunition in emergencies; carrying V-mail, blood plasma, and medical supplies; getting a rush shipment of grenades to Guadalcanal when they were needed desperately; bringing block mica from India; rubber seeds from Liberia to the Western Hemisphere; and tin and tungsten from China.

The command pilots have flown over Arctic waste lands and jungles, encountering all types of weather from desert sandstorms to cold banks, thousands of feet up, which deposit large quantities of ice on a plane's wings in a few minutes. Pilots have flown into strange countries where there were only native populations and where landing and refueling conditions were uncertain. The command's own flight surgeons have been active along all routes used for ferrying purposes, seeing to it that modern medical equipment is available to all stopping points and that pestholes are eradicated.

By the end of 1943 the command had a personnel strength of more than 85,000 officers and men. Its strength now totals more than 108,000 officers and men.

Dealing in the vernacular terms of what is "hot," "less hot," and so forth, air transportation priorities is a system for determining the order of moving of personnel, cargo, and mail according to their urgency in the war effort. Campaigns may succeed or fail, depending upon receipt of supplies, important parts, mail, or key personnel. The best kind of judgment must be used to utilize the valuable space to the best advantage—there is always a greater demand than supply. Losses of planes have been extremely small in both ferrying and transport operations. In 1943 the Air Transport Command made safe delivery of 99.7 percent of all the planes it accepted for delivery, despite occasional attempts by the enemy to interfere.

ARMY SERVICE FORCES

The need for adequate supplies and equipment for an army of 7,700,000 individuals deployed over a world-wide area and operating under every conceivable condition is naturally tremendous. Requirements for ammunition, guns, tanks, and combat vehicles, the many highly developed and secret mechanisms for the task of communications, offensive, and defensive chemical-warfare devices, subsistence, clothing, and medical supplies and equipment are showing the results of actual battle experience. A review of a few of the highlights should aid in an appreciation of the commitments of the Army Service Forces.

ORDNANCE

American ordnance is winning fame on battlefields the world over. As has been explained, ordnance materials are expended very rapidly in the most successful of engagements. The fighting in Italy has been accompanied by unprecedented artillery action, actual expenditures of certain types of ammunition having exceeded anticipated rates some six times over. An urgent demand for a larger proportion of powerful artillery of great range has also come from these operations. With this also comes an increase in requirements for ammunition. On the other hand, requirements for items such as light tanks, self-propelled artillery, and 40- and 90-millimeter guns show large decreases due to reductions in the number of armored, antitank, and antiaircraft units. Two groups of rockets have been standardized and found satisfactory, one of which is fired from the famous bazooka. Ordnance demands have caused the procurement of approximately 650,000 submachine guns, 15,000,000 hand grenades, 16,000,000 75-millimeter shells, and 170,000,000 rounds of one type of antiaircraft ammunition. In addition, over 13,500,000,000 rounds of .30- and .50-caliber ammunition have been procured—enough for 100 rounds for every person in the United States.

COMMUNICATIONS

Procurement of the thousands and millions of highly secret mechanisms for the task of communications has been developed and made routine. Among the devices being purchased are not only the familiar walkie-talkie for troops, but intra-plane facilities for the largest bomber. Radar devices of proven value are being procured in large quantities and weather stations in remote inaccessible areas are being multiplied and manned by the newest mechanisms. In addition to radar, all types of communication equipment, radio, telephone, and telegraph are constantly being improved to provide our troops with the latest and best equipment.

CHEMICAL WARFARE

The character of the war to date does not include the use of toxic chemicals in munitions. In keeping with the nature and tempo of the war effort, the manufacture and storage of toxic chemicals (beyond required stock-piling) is not emphasized in next year's requirements. Incendiary bombs are being emphasized, however. The familiar 4-pound magnesium bomb has been bundled into an amiable cluster, 110 of these bombs forming a 500-pound cluster. A further development is the 100-pound and 500-pound bomb filled with a "goop" mixture. In actual performance, this bomb, on impact, explodes, scattering the flaming blobs in all directions and it is claimed that this mixture is almost unextinguishable. Another notable item is the 4.2 mortar, called in soldier's slang, the "goon" gun. This is an exceedingly well engineered weapon, firing a large shell, the filling of which is either a high explosive or white phosphorus; the white phosphorus does duty as an im-

pressive casualty producer, for use in smoke screens, and in the jungle, for identification purposes. This is just another example of how the several components of the Army have adapted themselves to new conditions and utility.

CONSTRUCTION

The War Department's construction program is now 99 percent completed or in place, making the program for 1945 in continental United States very substantially below that for 1944. The program for overseas areas, on the whole, also is smaller but with marked difference between the various theaters, defense commands, and other bases, depending upon their individual strategic position and tactical requirements. Careful controls have been established to insure that all construction authorized should be absolutely essential for effective troop training, for the health of troops, for housing prisoners of war, or for the efficient movement of personnel and supplies. Requirements for 1945 for the Army Air Forces are principally those necessitated by the larger and heavier aircraft, such as strengthening and extending existing runways, taxiways and aprons, and the auxiliary facilities. Construction at ground-force installations will be minor and for the Army Service Forces will be confined largely to further extensions and improvements to storage and shipping facilities.

Construction in the Western Hemisphere outside continental United States and in other overseas bases which have passed their peak of activity, is practically completed. At these, only the problems of upkeep remains. In the more active theaters and in those which will become active, it will be necessary to continue new construction of airfields, roads, bridges, shipping and storage facilities, and the other adjuncts, particularly in those areas where our forces are moving forward.

QUARTERMASTER

While the peak procurement of clothing was realized in calendar year 1943, the trend of subsistence procurement will expand and be more than twice the deliveries of 1942. During 1943, the Quartermaster developed and procured more than 70,000 different items of food, clothing, and equipment, from parachute rations to nylon sleeping bags. Special rations for the combat soldier are provided to insure sustained action under highly mobilized operations. Necessary clothing and equipment to meet the ever-changing conditions of the various theaters continue to cause procurement of thousands of items in huge quantity. We must continue to design, develop, and supply our men the finest food and equipment yet devised by the mind of man. No instrument of war can compare with the well-fed and well-equipped soldier. The definitely established goal—"Enough and on time"—is being realized and we will continue to keep the American soldier the best fed, best clothed, and the best-cared-for fighting man in history.

TRANSPORTATION

During the calendar year 1943 and during the first quarter of 1944 continued progress was made in shipping men and supplies overseas. During 1943, 1,870,000 men were transported overseas. During the same year, 28,500,000 measurement tons of Army cargo were shipped. Despite the great increase in men and supplies flowing through American ports, port conditions have continued fluid. Within the United States, the War Department, during 1943, moved nearly 88 million short tons of freight by rail and motor. Transportation was arranged for ten and one-half million men during that year. Despite these tremendous totals, Army freight during the fourth quarter of 1943 was only 7.7 percent of total freight ton-miles hauled by American railroads. In May 1944, a record of almost 4,000,000 measurement tons of Army cargo were moved overseas, almost twice the tonnage moved overseas in May 1943. The peak tonnage moved overseas in World War No. 1 was in November 1918, when 829,000 measurement tons were transported. In this war it has been determined that each man overseas requires one measurement ton per month of maintenance supplies, and it takes 6 measurement tons of initial equipment for him. The supplies, of necessity, vary widely depending on the area to which they are being sent.

HEALTH OF THE ARMY

Every effort is being extended to insure a continuance of the fine health record established in the Army to date and to adequately care for battle casualties. The noneffective rate for the Army overseas and within the United States has remained constant throughout 1943 and the first quarter of 1944 at approximately 4 percent of the total strength. Of all patients admitted to hospitals and quarters overseas during 1942 and 1943, 89 percent had been returned to duty by December 31, 1943. A most important new project in the medical program this year is the procurement of penicillin, the wonder drug in combating infection and disease. It is expected that the production of penicillin will be increased within the coming year to assure that ample quantities are available for all military needs and an increased amount for civilian use. An extensive reconditioning program has been undertaken in order to insure that men returning to military duties are fully capable physically of performing the work expected of them. In addition, adequate provision for the rehabilitation of amputees, deaf, and blind have been made. It can only be hoped that the fine health record established to date can be continued and, of course, improved if humanly possible.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

With the enormous purchasing programs which it has been necessary for the War Department to initiate and maintain for the last 3 years, it is inevitable that certain individual items would be overprocured and others would be rendered surplus by reason of improvements in types of equipment and changes in types

of troop units. The Baruch-Hancock report on war and post-war adjustment policies recommended that disposal of surplus property be undertaken by a surplus property administrator. Such an office has been created, and disposal of War Department property is performed in accordance with instructions issued by the Surplus Property Administrator. The intelligent handling of this very troublesome aspect of total war procurement will lessen the quantity of stocks of matériel of all kinds on hand at the end of the war for which the Army will have only a limited use and which civilian economy will be unable to absorb. That is the aim, and it is being prosecuted to the fullest extent.

CONTRACT TERMINATIONS

The stabilization of procurement of war matériel and the policy of the War Department in only buying those things for which there is a definite need have led to the adoption of a policy of terminating those contracts which cover supplies and equipment no longer needed to further the war effort. It should be remembered that contract terminations in no way signify a let-down in production needs; they merely reflect the fact that the needs of war are fluid, changing constantly as the situation continues to change. The number and face value of contracts terminated to date have been relatively small in proportion to the total. In most cases "cut-backs," change orders, and terminations are followed by orders for new and improved equipment. We may expect that the total demands of the armed forces on industry will not decline, at least, until success of our invasion of the European Continent is assured.

ARMY GROUND FORCES

The third major component of the Army of the United States is the Army Ground Forces. The broad mission of this component is to organize and train ground combat forces. Throughout the present emergency every effort has been made to provide as thorough and effective training as the situation overseas permitted. This policy enhances the chances of success in our war effort and minimizes our losses. The organization and training of new ground units should be completed in the not too distant future unless the manpower situation and other conditions require the formation of units not presently contemplated. However, the training of both commissioned and enlisted replacements must continue to meet the requirements of our expanding operations.

Schools are a vital link in building and maintaining fighting units. The capacity of the several Ground Forces schools are studied constantly in order to meet, but not exceed, the needs. As units are shipped overseas, school requirements for formed units are lowered, but, on the other hand, as the need for replacements increases, so also is there need for additional schooling for them. The net result is that the over-all capacities of schools probably will decrease during the remainder of 1944, but in 1945 the figure

will increase again to near present capacities.

Supplies and equipment for the Army Ground Forces normally are furnished by the Army Service Forces. However, funds are placed directly under the control of the Army Ground Forces for civilian employees, for supplies and equipment not available from other sources, and for the field training of units in both small and large maneuvers.

The burdens which the various units of the Army Ground Forces are called upon to bear on the field of battle are well known to all of us. That they have and will continue to carry those burdens and discharge their responsibilities in a manner reflecting great credit to our country is well assured. The many reports of the heroic action of individuals and units of these forces in the present war have been a source of great inspiration to all of us. And they still have the terrifying big, decisive job to complete. It is upon the shoulders of these men now overseas, and their comrades in the United States who are scheduled to go overseas, that the fate of the final phase of over-all strategy depends.

While you must appreciate that the facts and figures which I have cited above give but a very sketchy review of the over-all task which has been accomplished by our Army and the problems which are still to be faced, I hope they will provide the basis for a more complete understanding of our situation today. Although practically the total efforts of our military leaders are being concentrated on the present period of decisive action, and the biggest battles are still ahead of us, plans are being developed for demobilization upon the partial or complete cessation of operations. This does not mean that the war is practically over. But, after winning the war we must also win the peace. There must be effective action immediately following a collapse of one or more of the Axis Powers to allow industry to reconvert to peacetime production, provide for the employment and general welfare of our veterans, and, in general, protect the civilian economy for the furtherance and improvement of American livelihood. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the now definitely established need for stand-by reserves of facilities and equipment for the production of noncommercial items necessary to provide for military security.

POST-WAR SECURITY

Let us turn now to some problems of security which should demand our attention and action in the post-war period. Under the Constitution the Congress is charged with the responsibility of providing for the common defense by raising and supporting armies; providing and maintaining a Navy, and for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia. The size and strength of these components of our security is determined, to a large extent, by our foreign policy and our domestic situation. Therefore, the term "common defense" or "security" will be flexible and in the last analysis dependent upon the will of

the Congress acting for our people. Prudence, common sense, and recognition of our responsibility dictate action along definite and well-established lines.

PROPOSED MERGER OF WAR AND NAVY
DEPARTMENTS

Does national security require a merger of the Army and Navy Departments? This question has been brought to the attention of the people recently by the proceedings of the Post-war Military Policy Committee, presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. The committee can do much good. Public discussion is always helpful. While I am opposed to a consolidation of the War and Navy Departments, I do believe in a closer and more effective coordination of the activities of these all-important agencies of defense. Our people have not been informed of the extent coordination presently prevails or that did prevail before the institution of the joint chiefs of staff. There is no better way for a layman to become acquainted with the team work that exists and is practiced by these Departments than to sit, as I have year after year, examining minutely military budgets. This brings one into contact with every phase of the military establishment.

Having followed the hearings of the Post-war Committee to the extent they have been published, I have been disappointed because the committee has not called in the men who actually do the work and who are doing a splendid job, to tell us what has been done in the way of cooperation and the elimination of duplication. These hearings before you now and hearings on Army and Navy appropriation bills for years past are replete with evidence of one service utilizing the other in matters of procurement, in matters of research and development, in joint training operations, and divers other ways.

We have unity of command in the person of the President of the United States who under the Constitution is the Commander in Chief of all our armed forces. The consolidations we need to effect economy and efficiency in operation is in the lower echelons in those agencies which build up, implement, and train military and naval forces and furnish them with their transportation, supplies, and equipment.

The complaints we hear with reference to two separate defense establishments resulting in duplication and extravagance by providing separate production, repair, storage, and research facilities; separate procurement agencies, airfields, forces of ground based airplanes, troop and cargo water transportation systems, lies at our own door. Divided jurisdiction, jealousy of powers and prerogatives of committees play an important role in bringing about the evils of which we complain. The lack of complete knowledge of service needs by the Congress due to the Budget and Accounting Act is another factor to be dealt with by the Congress.

PROBLEMS INVOLVED

The problem of post-war security will involve an army of occupation; the ac-

quisition and use of air and naval bases in both the Atlantic and Pacific; our obligations for maintaining an international peace force; and external and internal security. These involvements will be expensive but essential. How to provide maximum security with minimum cost is our problem. Only time and experience can prove what is best.

SUGGESTED SOLUTION

First, there should be a change in the rules and procedures of the Congress to effect the establishment of a single national-defense legislative committee in each body and as a natural corollary a single national-defense appropriations subcommittee.

Secondly, legislation to provide:

First. A permanent Joint Chiefs of Staff organization clothed with necessary powers to effectuate our national defense policies.

Second. Amend the Budget and Accounting Act to require the direct transmission to Congress the estimates of the defense establishments as determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Constitution specifically places the responsibility upon the Congress to provide for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy which they create. We are not discharging that responsibility when an intermediate agency determines the submission that shall be presented and department officials are denied, by the law itself, to protest or seek restoration of budget reductions "unless at the request of either House of Congress," even in time of war.

Third. The largest air force in the world.

Fourth. A Navy incomparably greater than that of any other Nation.

Fifth. A Regular Army with a minimum of one-half million officers and men as the core of our land forces.

Sixth. Compulsory military training for a period of 1 year for every able-bodied male citizen between the ages of 18 and 21 years, the year to be selected by the trainee. Those taking a full senior high or college R. O. T. C. course to be exempted from compulsory training. Inestimable physical benefits, mental discipline, and spiritual growth would result from such training.

Seventh. Placement of trainees in the Enlisted Reserve for a period of 10 years after completion of compulsory training. This would give our country the reservoir of trained enlisted personnel so essential in modern war.

Eighth. An enlarged R. O. T. C. program to provide an officer pool. Our program of officer training during the past two decades has paid with dividends to our national security.

Ninth. That all service schools for the United States Army be available and used by Reserve and National Guard personnel.

Tenth. A National Guard with a minimum of one-half million men. In the present conflict our National Guard divisions have performed magnificently in every theater of action. In the beginning they constituted the spearhead of both defense and offense. The National Guard gives us our largest group of offi-

cers and men available for instant use by State and Nation at lowest cost.

These suggestions are offered with the hope they will be considered and adopted to provide our country with security. There must be no more Pearl Harbors! We must profit by history. We cannot gamble our birthright upon treaties and oceans. Neither can we expect that England, France or some other nation will always be able to hold back the hordes of would-be world dictators until we can mobilize our industrial and manpower resources for final victory. The complacency which was so evident prior to the present war must be avoided. God save us from impractical, idealistic, suicidal pacifism. Our armed forces must be maintained in sufficient strength and power to adequately safeguard the future of America. Through these measures we can best insure the protection of our families and our homeland against future would-be aggressors. Adequate preparedness can and will effectively discourage our potential enemies from ever again attempting to destroy our principles of government and our way of life. Eternal vigilance is the price of safety. We must be ready and willing to defend our liberties and freedoms. With this spirit and God's help we will keep our rendezvous with destiny as a free people.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a member of the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has made, I suppose, what he may think is a valedictory speech on the subject of the military policy of the country. But I hope it is not a valedictory. A message such as he has given us, expressing his faith, ought not stop with his speech on the floor today, and knowing the gentleman as I do, I am sure that it will not.

As has been said, we who have worked on the committee with the gentleman from Alabama, JOE STARNES, know that his heart is committed to the welfare of the American Republic, known as the United States. What he has said, he believes, and what he has said, he has tried to work for in the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the functions of an appropriation committee dealing with the War Department in time of war are somewhat difficult. On the one hand members of the committee face the possible suggestion by some people that they are overdoing the thing in giving the War Department a free hand with so much money. On the other hand they lay themselves open to the charge, as the years come on, that they were profligate with the people's money. If we do not appropriate enough, and the Army lacks in any respect at any point, then of course censure properly would be given. On the other hand, in wartime it is impossible for Members of Congress, with other duties besides that of membership on a particular committee, to know all that is going on in a global war, and certainly it is impossible for them to know what the course of the war will be. Necessarily then, the com-

mittee relies in large part upon estimates of the Chief of Staff and the fiscal officers in the War Department as to what is needed. At the same time the committee would be derelict in its duty, in my judgment, if it just said, "What do you want? Come and take it, and spend it as you will."

So, last year and again this year, we made some reductions, \$378,000,000 in the bill last year, and \$241,000,000 in this \$49,000,000,000 bill before us.

I think I can say in all fairness that the subcommittee in its deliberations, both on the bill last year and on the bill this year, has sought to accomplish positive results, and yet to make such interrogations as would insure that the War Department knows that the country does not want money wasted or unnecessarily spent.

There is a little expression that General Marshall used when he was talking with us about the requests in this bill that I should like to pass on to the record. He was talking off the record, so this will not show in the hearings but this might well have been on the record. It was a phrase that he used when he was talking about the progress of the war. It has been helpful to me and I hope it will be helpful to the Members. He said, "The speed of this war will be its economy."

"The speed of this war will be its economy."

I pass that on to you and I hope, through you, to the people in the country, as the speed of this war this summer brings home the terrible cost of the war in lives, in casualties, and in hopes deferred or blasted as far as individuals are concerned. Yet if you think about it a little, that can be true. If we hit with the strength and the power that has been provided by the appropriations of the Congress; if we hit with the maximum capacity of the country when we have the enemy on the run, it will be cheaper than to let him slow down and catch his breath.

So if the war does move with tremendous speed this summer and brings home the costs in money and in life such as people have not anticipated, let us keep in mind that in the final analysis it is much better to win the war and get it done than to have it drag on for months and months or years and years, adding the cost of attrition to the actual cost that would otherwise come anyway.

This committee in considering this bill has, I think, had that in mind, and it has had in mind its positive responsibility to provide the necessary sinews of war and at the same time to make such investigation into the expenditures of the past year and into the proposed expenditures for the new fiscal year as would give it as much assurance as could be given that the money is needed and will be spent properly.

We have adopted in the committee, we have fostered in the Congress, certain procedures designed to accomplish that. The gentleman from Alabama spoke of the need for greater correlation in the lower echelons of the armed forces of

the country, the Army and the Navy. He mentioned particularly the possibility of coordinating or even combining the Appropriation Subcommittees for the War Department and the Navy Department into a single Committee on National Defense Appropriations. The only coordination that exists today aside from the fraternal relations existing between the members of the committee and the Members of the House is the clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. John Pugh, who serves as the clerk also to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy Department. Good as he is, he cannot give every member of each committee all that he knows. So, I join with what has been said as to the value and the importance of a closer coordination and possible merging of the subcommittees that deal with appropriation of the defense arms of the country. The illustration has been used before, but it may again be in order to repeat that on the outskirts of Washington the Navy Department maintains its Anacostia flying field with its weather station; and within a stone's throw of it, so to speak, is Bolling Field, maintained by the War Department, and a weather station for the War Department. A proper coordination of our defense activities and of our expenditures in this country might eliminate many such possible duplications, and something along that line is in order. But our consideration of those things is limited because we have the war on our hands and we have the war to win.

Yet we must not admit that we are in the position of the man who never fixed his roof because he could not fix it when it was raining and did not need to when it was not.

During the presentation of previous bills, and particularly before the war was actually on us, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] sought to accomplish savings through the elimination of cost-plus contracts. When that proved to be impossible, we looked for some method that would reduce excessive costs yet permit the arming of the country to go forward at top speed. In our committee, we developed the idea of renegotiation, and I was pleased to have the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, tell us that in the 2 years of the operation of the renegotiation statute, from the 28th of April 1942, to the 30th of April 1944, the savings to the country amounted to \$4,700,000,000 in the expenditures of the War Department alone, \$2,600,000,000 of this was recovered in cash and \$2,100,000,000 was accomplished through price reductions.

The over-all savings to the country through the renegotiation statute, the Secretary told us, was \$7,100,000,000, the difference between the \$4,700,000,000 and the \$7,100,000,000 representing savings accomplished through the programs of the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the Treasury, and other procurement agencies of the country.

Some people have failed to realize that in the last revenue act, where a time was set for the expiration of the renegotiation statute, that the benefits of the pro-

cedure developed through the operation of the renegotiation statute are to be continued through what is called price adjustment. If any of you have not familiarized yourselves with that I suggest you look up title VIII of the revenue law, which carries the text of the price-adjustment statute, which provides that:

Whenever the Secretary of War deems that the price of any article or service of any kind which is required by his Department, or directly or indirectly required, furnished, or offered in connection with the war as a part of the performance or procurement of any contract with his department or any subcontract thereunder, is unreasonable or unfair, the Secretary may require the person furnishing or offering to furnish such article or service to negotiate to fix a fair and reasonable price therefor.

The benefits of price readjustment, therefore, developed through the operation of the renegotiation statute are continued through the price adjustment section of the revenue act. It is provided, of course, that if the contractor finds or feels that the price determined by the Secretary is unreasonable or unfair or unjust to him, he may appeal to the courts.

I believe the membership of the House is entitled to know that the experience in price adjustment that has been accomplished through renegotiation and through price schedules will not be lost.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the gentleman able to state how much of those savings through renegotiation are on contracts executed prior to the insertion in the contracts of a provision providing for a voluntary reconsideration of the contract?

Mr. CASE. I am not sure I am able to answer the question of the gentleman, even if I understand it. Does the gentleman mean how much of the savings were accomplished by voluntary reductions before the renegotiation statute was enacted?

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand it, there were many contracts for war materials executed by the Government prior to the time they began inserting in the contract a provision that they could be renegotiated and when by act of Congress we made them renegotiate. How much of these savings came about by reason of the contracts having such provision in them?

Mr. CASE. The figures I gave related to savings accomplished after the passage of the renegotiation statute.

Mr. CURTIS. But at the time of the passage of that law it was the practice to insert a provision in the contracts permitting a renegotiation, was it not?

Mr. CASE. The gentleman says after passage of the act?

Mr. CURTIS. At the time of the passage of the act.

Mr. CASE. There had been some voluntary renegotiation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that in some contracts, for example, in the Signal Corps contracts, they for a long time have had this provision which permitted of a renegotiation between the Government and the contractor?

Mr. CASE. They may have done so. That is, such a provision could be a part of any contract if both parties wanted it. Mandatory renegotiations, however, was proposed and was adopted, as stated at the time, because there were some contractors who were unwilling to reconsider the prices even in spite of the fact that experience showed that they could produce an article at much less than was anticipated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Do the contracts that are now being executed for war materials contain a renegotiation clause?

Mr. CASE. The renegotiation clause expires by statute at the end of the year but it may be extended by the President for an additional 6 months. However, it does expire by statute. The new contracts that are being negotiated now, whether the contracts themselves set it forth or not, are covered by the price adjustment title in the revenue bill. Price adjustment is made a part of all contracts by this statute.

Mr. CURTIS. The termination the gentleman spoke of is a dead line upon which settlement must be reached; is that right?

Mr. CASE. Yes. In the case of 95 percent of the 1942 contracts that work is completed now.

Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes I want to discuss certain things which the committee did in going into expenditures in the past year and the indicated policies of the War Department with respect to the coming year. I am not going to take the time to do more than to refer to some of the topics that Members have expressed interest in at various times. I shall give the topics and cite some of the page references in the hearings so that the Members may see the scope of the hearings and, if they are interested, read the hearings.

Many Members have been interested in the possibilities of the helicopter and what the War Department is doing in that field. You can find testimony on that by referring to the hearings at pages 317 and 327, and following.

A great many Members have been disturbed by the publicity during the past year in reference to the parachutes that the War Department is using. The charges had been made that the War Department was derelict in failing to provide our forces with the single-point release parachute. There is quite a story on that. Testimony on that will be found at pages 340 of the hearing and following. We are getting single-point release chutes in the Army Air Forces now.

Some questions have arisen about the use or nonuse of self-sealing gas tanks in the planes of the Transport Command.

Testimony on that will be found at pages 316 and following.

Probably as interesting a section of the hearings as any is that which deals with the developments in medicine and particularly in the field of preventive medicine. You will find the testimony of the Surgeon General at pages 348 and following of particular interest on that subject.

At page 366 you will find testimony about the use of the sulfa drugs and penicillin. The Surgeon General told us that at one time the medical branch was concerned about the shortage of quinine but their experience in the use of atabrine has been such they know better how to handle the dosage and today a shortage of quinine does not alarm the War Department.

I have had some correspondence about the relative slowness of promotion for officers who are overseas as compared with those who are stationed in this country, particularly in the Medical Corps. Testimony on that will be found at pages 368 and following.

A great many Members have been interested in the story of the WAC's, the Women's Army Corps. The testimony on that will be found at pages 534 and following.

Many Members have also been interested and will soon be involved in a question about the training of the WASPS, and the commissioning of women in the Army Air Forces. You will find helpful testimony on that at pages 305 and following.

Another subject that will be before the House shortly deals with the problem of the termination of contracts and the reconversion of industry. The position of the War Department will be found at pages 569 and following.

Every Member of the Congress has had a great deal of correspondence about allowances and allotments for members of the families of men and women in the service. Personally, considering the size of the job, considering the fact that the work had to start from scratch, that a new organization had to be built up, and allowances had to be worked out for between three and four million people in the armed forces at the very outset, I feel that the work performed by General Gilbert and his staff has been remarkable. It is outstanding when the size of the problem is remembered.

General Somervell has a very interesting statement on the reorganization of the War Department. At page 64 of the hearings Members will find a table which shows in graphic form the reorganization of much of the old War Department under the Army Service Forces.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman from South Dakota tell us if the committee gave any consideration to the disposition of tracts of land that have been taken over by the War Department during this emergency, which

will, no doubt, be disposed of some time after the war emergency is over?

Mr. CASE. Yes. The committee interrogated representatives of the War Department on that at some length. The gentleman will find that on page 571, and again at page 582 appears testimony by Secretary Patterson and by Colonel Hausman on the disposition of realty and property. The gist of the testimony is that the War Department now has authority to dispose of real estate if it is in the interest of the war effort. I remember asking particularly whether the War Department had that authority with respect to lands that had been acquired prior to the war and under some act of Congress. The interpretation is that under the War Powers Act they do have that authority if the disposition is in the interest of the war effort.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I would like to ask if any consideration was given to the thought that these lands be returned to the prior owners, and that they be given an opportunity to bid on them. Was any thought given to that subject?

Mr. CASE. I am interested in having the gentleman ask that question because it so happens that I have introduced a bill on that particular subject which does propose that a year's priority shall be given to the former owner to repurchase his land.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I want to assure the gentleman that this legislation ought to come before the Congress. These owners whose property was taken away by eminent domain should have the right to repurchase the land if they so desire, at least for a limited period of time. I am pleased that the gentleman has introduced such a resolution.

Mr. CASE. I hope that legislation may be favorably considered. I may say, however, that the War Department in commenting upon that and other bills of similar character has indicated that it would be a difficult thing to administer. So I welcome the gentleman's help in the matter and will be glad to refer him to some correspondence I have had with the War Department on that subject to see if we can work out some satisfactory way administratively to handle the matter.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Regardless of the administrative difficulties, this great war agency of ours that went out and took this property owes some consideration to these people who were forced from these lands. Regardless of some of the administrative difficulties I think it would be unfair not to give them the opportunity to buy the land back instead of releasing wholesale large tracts of land to corporations or to some other group to dispose of after the war. I think the gentleman's bill should have consideration, and very serious consideration.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, because I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Related to the problem of the disposition of surplus real estate is the disposition of surplus property, and also the return of equipment and property of the

United States from abroad after the war. I think there are at least three fields in which we are going to have some serious problems arise, and which will bear watching. One is the outcome of the Canol oil project, to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] referred. Another is the rights that the United States will have in air bases and air routes which are being established for the benefit of the wartime Air Transport Command.

I asked General Reybold a question on this during our hearings. General Reybold is the Chief of Engineers, and has charge of the construction of projects.

The question I should like to ask is whether, in respect of other proposals that are in Canada, including certain depots and airports and other installations of that type, and also with respect to similar projects in what is called the South Atlantic route if guaranties have been obtained of the governments in which these projects are located that we shall have post-war access to the use of those facilities?

The record answer of General Reybold is:

I cannot answer that question, Mr. CASE.

We had some discussion of the matter, I may say, off the record, and it was apparent to me, without quoting anybody, that the War Department, and particularly the Engineers Branch of the War Department, feels that their duty is to construct these projects if they get orders to do so through the War Department, through the Commander in Chief. They do not determine policies. Their duty is to build what they get orders to build. The responsibility rests with the President and the State Department to determine the rights that we have in the post-war operation of any facilities outside of the United States. I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will go into this matter.

Personally, I am not at all satisfied, either with respect to the Canol project or the air and sea bases being built outside of the United States, that we have any adequate guaranty to the use of those, or the salvage of any rights, after the war is over.

In conclusion let me say this: "Do not sell any part of our armed forces short, however, so far as doing the job ahead is concerned."

I have noticed lately that some people are saying, "Well, it looks as if the Air Forces are not going to do what we were told they could do in the war." As the present military movement in Europe unfolds, the real value of the strategic bombing that the Air Forces have been doing will become apparent. In World War No. 1, as we pressed the enemy back, he was still self-contained; he still had something inside the wall he had built. As this movement in Europe progresses, however, by the strategic bombing which has destroyed transportation and supply centers and as it becomes apparent how strategic bombing has destroyed the means of making war, we will see the real value of air power.

But when I say that, I do not want to minimize—in fact, I want to take this

opportunity to emphasize—the part that is being played by the Ground Forces, particularly the Infantry. You will recall that General Marshall, over at the Congressional Library, told us that if we have a word of praise to give to somebody connected with the war effort, we should give it to the Infantry—the boys there in the dust, and the dirt, and the mud, out in all kinds of weather, who simply have to be there and take whatever comes. The boys who are on the ground, the boys who have to fight hand to hand at times, and really occupy the countries that have been occupied by the enemy, and then occupy the enemy's country itself—they are undergoing a hardship and a suffering and a sacrifice that is beyond compare. There is little glamor to their job; but we cannot win without them. The Infantry is still the queen of battles.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The appropriation for the WAC's, I understand, is contained in this bill.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that they have done an outstanding piece of work?

Mr. CASE. They have done an outstanding piece of work. I hope the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, who had so much to do with the institution of the Corps, will read the letter which I placed in the hearings. It was from Lt. Vera Mankinen, who was one of the first five WAC's to land in Australia, and told about the reception they had from General MacArthur, and gave General MacArthur's comment on the work of the Woman's Army Corps.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And they have released a great many men for active fighting.

Mr. CASE. That is right.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, if the Committee will bear with me a few moments, I should like to present a brief accounting of the stewardship of the men composing the membership of the subcommittee which has shaped military appropriation measures over the period commencing several months before Pearl Harbor.

All of the seven members of the subcommittee today were members of the subcommittee which drafted the appropriation bill for the fiscal year which began July 1, 1941, and five of the seven were members of the subcommittee when the Germans marched into Poland on September 1, 1939.

The five are Chairman J. BUELL SNYDER, JOE STARNES, LANE POWERS, ALBERT ENGEL, and myself. The two joining us in 1941 are GEORGE MAHON and FRANCIS CASE, and I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that it has been a genuine privilege to serve with such distinguished men.

The responsibility of this group has spread over the ante- and post-Pearl

Harbor periods and the record is one, I am frank to say, of which we feel quite proud, and of which we feel the House should be quite proud, because it has followed our recommendations and thus appropriated them as its own handiwork.

We have come far since 1939, Mr. Chairman. Appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year which began on July 1, 1939, amounted to \$742,125,171. The appropriations for that year made provision for an enlisted force of 165,000 men and 13,796 officers and warrant officers. At that time we possessed less than 2,320 serviceable airplanes, which was then the objective number. We were just beginning a modest measure of implementation in consequence of a newly promulgated protective mobilization plan. In fact, we were just awakening to the President's admonition that our national defense, in the light of the increasing armament of other nations, was inadequate for purposes of national security.

The year following—the fiscal year which began July 1, 1940, which date was less than a month before Dunkerque and but a few days before France surrendered, we responded to the urge to get prepared for the worst, and the appropriations for that year climbed to \$5,612,684,777, and there were authorized, besides, contractual obligations to the extent of \$2,913,136,397. And it was in that fiscal year that lend-lease was authorized and we became the "arsenal of democracy."

Readying ourselves for unpredictable eventualities, preparatory measures continued until Pearl Harbor, when the whole Nation responded as one to the call to arms.

The War Department, or perhaps I should say General Marshall, from that time on virtually dictated the budgets.

As of today, there has been available to the Army for obligation since July 1, 1940, the stupendous sum of \$185,951,185,221. Of that sum, \$35,523,958,837 has been for Army pay, travel, subsistence, clothing and equipage, and medical costs; approximately 19 percent of the total.

Of such total amount exceeding one hundred and eighty-five billions, \$60,192,083,410 has been directly for aviation. I say directly, because the air arm draws on some of the other branches for certain equipment and supplies. I think it is perfectly safe to say that the total for which aviation has been responsible, directly and indirectly, would run between 45 and 50 percent.

The remainder of the one hundred and eighty-five billions has gone into implementation, into housing, into training, into expediting production, into lend-lease, and into a variety of expenses incident to the performance and accomplishment of the program as a whole. Implementation embraces tanks, armored cars, technical vehicles, guns, bombs, and all kinds of ammunition, and the myriad of articles which modern soldiers use.

From the 13,796 officers earlier mentioned, we have gone to 705,000. From

the 165,000 men, we have gone to 6,955,000. From the less than 2,320 serviceable airplanes, we have become possessed of more than 75,000, and I wish to stress the fact that they are entirely different from the planes we were building when we first started aviation expansion. They are heavier, they are higher powered, they are speedier, and their firepower and bomb capacity is unbelievable. It is an air force of such potency as to assure complete victory. It is an air force of such striking power that only an egotistical fool would insist upon his nationals facing. It is an air force that can be sustained and further expanded, should that be necessary. But, best of all, it is an air force that will save to America the lives of thousands upon thousands of her sons.

I say without hesitancy that we possess today the finest trained and equipped army in the world. As to its courage, it never will be found wanting. It already has measured up to the glorious traditions established by other forces called to arms since the birth of the Republic. It has been built up and directed by a man who has been denied personal direction in the field because we would not spare him from over-all direction from Washington, but whom history will rank with Lee, and Jackson, and Pershing, and other renowned Americans who have had the responsibility of leadership in the past.

Gen. George Marshall, a product of V. M. I., which is one of the greatest military institutions on earth, early won the admiration and support of our subcommittee, and we have gone all-out in supporting the budgets that have come to us for effectuating his plans and policies. He has manifested his appreciation on more than one occasion, the latest expression of which you will find in the hearings on this bill. That appreciation has been expressed to you, my colleagues, through us, because we are but the servants of the House, and whatever credit is due is yours and ours jointly, and I want to include, also, the membership of the House Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee has paved the way for us to act promptly and in ways that have contributed to the expedition of the program as a whole.

I feel that I am not able to pay a merited tribute to my fellow members on your subcommittee. They are all doubtless much better equipped for this important position than I am but the unanimity with which we have done our work reflects the confidence which we each have in the other and our love for the common cause we cherish above all earthly things, the preservation of that freedom transmitted to us by our forefathers, and this confidence, love, and pride embraces and will always overshadow the life and career of John Pugh, our clerk, and one of the most valuable servants that ever graced a Federal position.

The uppermost thought in this Nation is the preservation of our soldiers on every battlefield and we have the will and the means to provide every agency and instrumentality to do this and history will accord to us in our generation the

honor of making every provision necessary to match their intrepid and indefinable bravery. This will still be their country when we are gone and may the ensuing peace be the realization of that peace and vision of Grady, the South's great orator, when he saw "all the nations of the world, harkening to the American drumbeat and girding up their loins, march amid the breaking of the millennial dawn into the paths of righteousness and peace."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 21 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who I think will have an historic announcement to make in his opening remarks.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] for giving me the opportunity to make the first announcement to the House regarding the news flash of which we have just learned to the effect that the mainland of Japan has been bombed today by American bombers. I regret my inability at the moment to supply any details but I join you in hoping that further details and favorable news will be forthcoming later today. Later in my remarks I shall have more to say about our biggest bomber, the B-29, which was undoubtedly used in this attack on Japan.

Now, let me direct your attention to the measure before us. Today we come to the largest and probably the most important bill of the year—the bill that makes \$49,000,000,000 available to the War Department to carry on the war for the fiscal year which begins the first of next month.

We do not know when the day of victory will arrive, but I confidently believe that the money provided herein will be the last major request of the War Department prior to the defeat of Germany and the conclusion of the European war.

WORK OF COMMITTEE

It has been the responsibility of our seven-man subcommittee on Army appropriations to conduct hearings and consider the various aspects of this bill for the past several weeks. It has been a very difficult but a very interesting assignment. General Marshall, Chief of Staff, appeared before us upon two occasions to discuss with us the war program and the various problems confronting the Army in the huge task of winning the war. We also had in attendance before our committee Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces; Mr. Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and scores of officers having to do with the planning and the winning of the war.

The men of the Army have given our committee complete cooperation. Let me say also that our committee on War Department appropriations has fully cooperated with the War Department in the preparation of this bill and in the bills which have previously been presented. As you know, our subcommittee on War Department appropriations has presented all the major money bills for the Army throughout the war.

The fighting equipment now being used by the men of our Army in the sec-

ond-front invasion was requested of our subcommittee many months ago by officials of the War Department and necessary approval was given and appropriations made by the Congress.

The war program is so huge that it is impossible for the human mind to grasp all of its ramifications. Our brave men are fighting on battle fronts throughout the world and the problem of directing their operations and supplying them with the necessities of war is big beyond description.

It would seem obvious that reports and justifications comprising 16 volumes of printed matter and the testimony of about 128 witnesses who appeared before our committee could not be reduced to such small proportions as to be put into a speech for this occasion.

EQUIPMENT AND WEAPONS OF WAR

Mr. Chairman, in this bill funds are included to feed, clothe, and provide for our 7,700,000-man Army. The warm clothing for aviators who fly in zero altitudes, clothing and equipment adequate for our men in the Far North or in the Tropics are provided herein.

Herein we provide the weapons and devices for the destruction of our enemies, the enemies of our freedom and security. The shells, the powder, high explosives, flame throwers, the bazooka, aircraft bombs from the small fragmentation bomb to the block-buster, the mightiest of heavy guns, certain secret devices, and innumerable other weapons designed for the destruction of our enemies are provided for in this bill. I might point out that our experience in Italy has demonstrated the necessity for even greater emphasis on heavy artillery, and the heavy artillery program is being expanded to meet the requirements.

Those who have attacked and defied our Nation and sought to destroy our freedom will meet the fiercest and deadliest combination that has ever been hurled against an enemy in the history of warfare. Up to the moment our enemies have only had a foretaste of what is to come, and come quickly. Brave and dauntless American boys, possessed with the finest equipment and the best weapons that the energy and genius of America can provide, are on the march, and woe be to those who oppose them during the momentous and tragic months which lie just ahead. There can be no doubt of the outcome. But it is a sad-denying thought that the red blood of American boys must be spilled and their lives sacrificed in order that victory may be won and the freedom and independence of our country preserved.

HEALTH AND WELFARE OF MEN IN SERVICE

Mr. Chairman, in this bill we not only provide for the weapons with which to destroy the enemies of freedom, we provide for the instruments of mercy for our own men wherever they may be. Upon request of the Surgeon General we are appropriating slightly less than one-half billion dollars for the medical and hospital department of the Army.

The drugs and surgical items provided are too numerous to mention. One of the large expenditures will be \$108,000,000 for the wonder drug penicillin, a drug

which is already saving hundreds of lives of American soldiers and which has greater possibilities for the future. Drugs to combat the various diseases of the Tropics and to fight malaria in the Southwest Pacific are provided.

Parents of men in the service have every reason to be grateful for the overall efficiency of the medical and hospital department of the Army. On the whole a marvelous job has been done in preserving the health and saving the lives of the men in uniform. It has been the constant effort of this committee to see that these boys are armed and equipped in such a way as to insure the return of the greatest possible number, and in addition, to insure as far as humanly possible that they will return with strong bodies and good health to enable them to carry on in the years to come. Many details of the medical program are discussed by Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk in the printed hearings beginning on page 348.

Your committee makes no apology for the money provided upon the request of the Army for the education, recreation, and entertainment of enlisted men during off-duty periods. We will soon have 4,000,000 soldiers overseas. No one will begrudge the \$17,926,000 provided for them in this bill for athletic equipment, only a few dollars per man. Phonographs and phonograph records, books, magazines are also provided. In testifying before our committee, General Byron, who has much to do with this program, said this:

Morale is a lot of little things. It is the little things the soldier wants but does not happen to have at the time, and the little things that, when delivered or sold to him, convince him that the best country on earth—his country—has not forgotten him.

ITEMS IN BILL

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not possible in this brief time to discuss many of the aspects of this bill. I should like to list here some of the major items which make up the \$49,000,000,000 provided for the Army by this legislation:

Pay (includes allotments for dependents).....	\$12, 095, 000, 000
Air Forces.....	12, 610, 200, 000
Ordnance Department (guns, ammunition, etc.).....	8, 599, 067, 600
Subsistence.....	2, 899, 251, 000
Engineer Service.....	2, 662, 212, 500
Signal Corps.....	2, 540, 491, 075
Transportation Corps.....	1, 850, 000, 000
Clothing and equipage.....	1, 721, 600, 000
Chemical Warfare Service.....	670, 000, 000
Medical Department.....	492, 204, 520

The most spectacular program is the program of the Army Air Forces. General Arnold and his aides gave our committee many details of the program, but if you read the hearings you will find that much of the testimony was stricken from the record as the publication of it would give vital information to the enemy.

The Army already has 75,000 airplanes. In this bill 41,345 additional planes are provided. The type of plane ranges from our heaviest bombers, and large numbers of them, to the training planes. However, relatively few of the planes are

trainers; nearly all of them are either bomber, fighter, or transport planes.

SURPRISES IN THE AIR

We are making adequate provision for additional Flying Fortresses, Liberators, medium bombers, fighters. Let me also point out that in this bill we have not failed to take note of and make additional provision for the B-29, the big brother of the Flying Fortress. The B-29 is our mightiest battleship of the air. Of its range, power, and possibilities our enemies have heard little to date, but to their sorrow they will hear much in the future.

The announcement which I made to the House a few moments ago to the effect that the first news flash had just been received regarding the bombing today of the mainland of Japan justifies the faith which we have shown in the B-29 and the public money which we have appropriated for the construction of these planes. We all anxiously await the details of the bombing and hope for good news. Of this we can be sure, the bombing today is only the beginning of what is to come.

In my judgment there is no doubt but that the enemy is due for many surprises in the air. In planes on hand and in production and in highly trained aviation personnel we far excel the enemy. But we want to maintain our advantage and we are providing \$78,000,000 in this bill for the financing of further experimentation and research in aviation.

WINNING THE PEACE

Mr. Chairman, we must not only dedicate ourselves to the winning of this war—and may we hope that victory will come sooner than we can now foresee—we must win the peace also. A victory won at so dear a price must be preserved for the longest possible span of years. If that fuller hope and prayer is to be realized America must assert her position of leadership in the world.

When Congress—Democrats and Republicans—by a roll call vote last September went on record favoring active participation by America in a program to preserve peace, I spoke for and voted for the resolution then pending. In my service here my voice and my vote shall always be recorded among those who are doing what they can to help win this war and keep it won. America has never had a more difficult and tragically important assignment.

Our Christian duty requires such a policy and our selfish interest demands it.

And in the same breath it is not inconsistent to say that after victory is won America must not abandon her military might. I stand four square against any policy which would require that America crash her air power into the scrap heap and sink her Navy into the sea. We cannot ignore the lessons which this war has taught. If we are to lead in the pursuit of peace we must remain adequately strong and alert; we must be able to demand the respect of the world if we are to preserve our freedom and our position in world leadership.

Of our battle-torn flag someone once said:

It is only a small bit of bunting,
It is only an old colored rag,
But thousands have died for its honor
And shed their best blood for the flag.

For my part the blood of heroes shed for the flag must be translated into a better and more peaceful world for the generations to come. In the post-war world peace must not be just a word which we find in the dictionary. America must cooperate with peace-loving nations and translate the word peace into a living reality.

PROVISIONS FOR RETURNING SERVICEMEN

The returning veteran must not be forgotten. He has not been forgotten by this Congress. It was heartening to see the House pass, without a dissenting vote, the so-called G. I. bill, indeed not a perfect bill, but designed to provide more adequate hospitalization, employment safeguards, education, and so forth for returning servicemen. America must not only fulfill her obligations of world leadership, the Congress and the people must see to it that she fulfills her obligation to returning servicemen, assisting them to readjust themselves to civilian pursuits and cooperating with them in keeping America free—keeping America the land of opportunity for generations to come. Freedom purchased at so dear a price must be jealously guarded and preserved. And wartime restrictions on the individual and on business enterprises will not be tolerated after victory is won.

Mr. Chairman, it seems ironical that while fighting for liberty we should have to give up some of our privileges of citizenship. For example, about 11,000,000 men now in the armed services have been taken from their homes and subjected to military discipline, they have been regulated and regimented, subjected to the hazards of war, and completely deprived of their accustomed peacetime liberties.

Americans remaining at home have also been deprived of some of their privileges. In domestic matters we have not all agreed. There have been upon occasions unnecessary waste, regulation, and bungling, bordering sometimes on the ridiculous, which I emphatically condemn. For my own part I have voted my convictions, keeping in mind the welfare of my constituents and my country, not hesitating to oppose measures which seemed to be against the public interest and aggressively supporting measures which seemed to be necessary to the winning of the war. Never can we afford to forget that the winning of the war must come first.

THE WAR COMES FIRST

The full and abundant cooperation and support which the people of West Texas have given me convinces me beyond doubt that the people I represent in Congress favor such a policy of putting the war above every other consideration. That has been the course which I have unwaveringly followed and shall continue to follow.

Parents and wives and sweethearts know that nearly 4,000,000 American

soldiers and hundreds of thousands of the men of our Navy and Marine Corps are on foreign soil and distant seas with their faces and their guns toward the enemy and with the high stake of human life and freedom in the balance. Heaven forbid that we should forsake them. For my part, as a citizen and as a public official the test of my conduct shall continue to be: Will this vote, will this speech, will this policy contribute to the winning of the war and bringing weary American boys back to their homes?

I heard a Texan who fought with the gallant Thirty-sixth Division at Salerno suggest that we at home at the end of each day might well ask ourselves this question: "What have I done today to earn the right to have an American soldier die for me tonight in Italy or some other theater of this war?" Today we could substitute the beaches of France for the beach at Salerno. And, Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to be sentimental; I am simply trying to be factual.

I am unable to understand those who have taken advantage of the war to resort to profiteering in industry and those who have gone on strike against the Government, withholding the weapons of offense and defense from our men on the battle fronts. These wartime strikes have produced anxiety, anger, and disunity among our people and hurt morale among servicemen more than all other factors combined. I cannot and will not defend the weak policy which our Government has pursued with respect to wartime strikes. My voice and my vote at every possible opportunity have steadfastly been against wartime strikes and wartime profiteers.

Yet, we have every reason to rejoice that on the whole, labor and industry have done a marvelous job in producing in record time the greatest array of fighting machines and weapons ever dreamed of by a nation at war.

We can also thank heaven for the farm people of America who have fought valiantly on the home front, giving their sons to the uniform, and in spite of manpower and machinery shortages, and inadequate prices for many products, have produced the greatest abundance ever known in the history of the Nation. I pay tribute to the farmers of America.

Mr. Chairman, I think in all these matters I am speaking the language and the sentiments of the people whom I have the honor to represent.

CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

My principal work as a Member of Congress during the last few critical years has been as a Member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army and War Department. Our committee has spent many weeks, a total of several months, in hearings on the various Army requests for support and money. General Marshall, Chief of Staff, has frequently expressed his gratitude to us for the wholehearted backing which we have given him in the greatest military assignment which America has ever undertaken. No Member of our seven-man subcommittee would claim undue credit; we have simply done our best to do the job assigned to us, a job which we have

regarded as of vital importance to the winning of the war and the preservation of American liberty.

But legislative work is only a part of congressional service here. Legislative matters are more important to the Nation as a whole but there has been more joy for me in seeking to be of assistance to the many hundreds of people from my district who have called upon me through the years in a personal way for information and assistance in matters great and small. It may have been the request of a school child for a bulletin or the inquiry of an anxious mother concerning the welfare of her son overseas. I have received an average of more than 10,000 letters and requests each year from the people of the Nineteenth District of Texas. Each request has been important to someone and, while it is sometimes impossible to fully perform the service requested, I have gladly sought to render every possible assistance.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is scheduled to be passed today, and I shall not longer detain the House. The recent opening of the second front has made even more urgent the necessity for fully approving the bill as recommended by our committee. As I said in the beginning, not only is this the largest appropriations bill of the year, but we have reason to believe that the money provided herein will be the last major request of the War Department prior to the defeat of Germany and the conclusion of the European war.

Times like these demand the best service that any American can render in whatever task to which he may have been assigned. Undoubtedly, the future of America and much that we hold sacred and dear is at stake. Amid the storm clouds of war it may well again be said:

Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light,
Protect us by thy might,
Great God, our King.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would like to ask my friend from Texas this question. He is an able Member of this House, a member of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, and also a genuine American.

While we are discussing appropriations for the War Department, necessary and vital appropriations for victory, I think it might be well for all of us to question why the War Department apparently can submit and have accepted a contract to do work, that work being done by a man who is not a citizen of the United States, as has occurred in the Pacific.

Hans Wilhelm Rohl is the alien who held contracts on vital defense projects. Here is a man who lived in the United States of America for 27 years without becoming a citizen. I am wondering where we could place the responsibility for the awarding of such a contract. I ask it in all good faith. I am asking myself the question.

I think there should be a determination of policy, not of the War Department alone, but an over-all policy of

the Government of the United States that none of its agencies can award contracts for any work to individuals or firms who are aliens or alien-controlled to do a construction job for the United States of America. What has transpired in the Pacific defense work is tragic in its implications. There can be no proper reason for an alien having done this construction program.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his reference to this matter. I am not fully familiar with all the facts of the case to which the gentleman refers but on the basis of my present information, I fully share the condemnation which the gentleman has expressed. It is indefensible. The full blame rests squarely upon the War Department for any wrongfully let contract. Only the War Department has the authority to let contracts on these jobs. Of course the Congress can only legislate. The Congress can appropriate money, but Congress has no authority under the law and under the Constitution to let contracts.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do it for the purpose of reference also to one Matthew L. Smith, who is secretary of the Mechanics Educational Society of America. In February 1944 this alien caused 37,000 American working men and women to leave their posts. This man holds a key position, then and now, in a strong labor organization. Smith has lived in the United States since 1927 and is not yet a citizen of this country.

In industry, in labor unionism, and in government itself, there are far too many individuals today who are accepting the privileges and profits and protection of America but who are giving no loyal code of citizenship in return. I believe the gentleman from Texas may agree with me that legislation introduced in Congress, now pending, which would cause an individual who does not diligently proceed with his citizenship to be taken into custody and deported immediately, might have merit. What would the gentleman say about that?

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The legislation which the gentleman from West Virginia suggests, and of which I believe he is the author, regarding the deportation of individuals under such circumstances not only has merit, it ought to be immediately considered by Congress and passed in appropriate form. A loyal American is worthy of every consideration but those who stab our country in the back and seek to undermine the foundations of our freedom have no place among us.

Of course, this Committee on Appropriations is not authorized to sponsor legislative bills. I am advised that some of the legislative provisions which we have found it necessary to have placed in this bill might possibly be objected to by the House Committee on Military Affairs.

So, of course, any legislative bill would first have to be presented and passed upon by the Committee on Military Affairs.

fairs of the House, a very able and distinguished committee, or other appropriate legislative committees.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. WEISS. When the gentleman spoke about the B-29's being the great brothers of the Flying Fortresses, the War Department has just issued a communique that a great task force of B-29's has just bombed the mainland of Japan, thereby officially confirming the statement made a few moments ago by my colleague from Texas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I want to say that under our system we are not supposed to have anything to do with the execution of our laws. We pass the laws and it is up to the executive branch of the Government to enforce them.

Mr. MAHON. That is American democracy.

Mr. NORRELL. But under the Constitution, in order that we can have economies and honesty in the affairs of certain activities of the Government, if it becomes necessary for us to use the purse strings in order to warn those people that we are not going to tolerate again instances which the gentleman from West Virginia mentioned awhile ago, I think we may have to go out on that limb.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. I think we not only need to pursue that policy but we have pursued it in many instances, and I think that practice needs to grow. Congress has considerable power to enforce its demands because of its control of the purse strings, as given to us under the Constitution.

Mr. NORRELL. We all appreciate the very fine work the gentleman and his committee has done in trying to get all of the officers of the War Department to discharge their duty honestly and faithfully and conscientiously.

Mr. MAHON. On the whole, the men of the War Department have done a wonderful job in handling the war program. Of necessity there has been much haste and there have been some abuses and much unnecessary waste in certain instances, but I am speaking of the overall picture.

I have the profoundest regard and respect for General Marshall, Chief of Staff, as an officer and as a man. Those of us who have dealt directly with him have great faith in his leadership. I pay tribute to the great majority of our military leaders, and I know the gentleman from Arkansas shares these sentiments.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. POWERS. I have no further request for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of the Army: For pay and allowances of the Army of the United States, including pay of Reserve officers and officers of the National Guard of the United States ordered to active duty under the provisions of section 37a and the fourth paragraph of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended; pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available; interest on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums authorized by law; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their agents; payments to military and civilian personnel in and under the Military Establishment due to the appreciation of foreign currencies as provided by the Act of March 26, 1934, as amended (5 U. S. C. 118c), and for every object and purpose specified therein; repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of War, or officers designated by him, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel in and under the Military Establishment; \$4,174,966,295: *Provided*, That the appropriations contained in this act shall not be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by nonflying officers at a rate in excess of \$720 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to such officers, and such nonflying officers shall be entitled to such rate of increase by performing three or more flights within each 90-day period, pursuant to orders of competent authority, without regard to the duration of such flight or flights: *Provided further*, That, during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, a flying officer as defined under existing law shall include flight surgeons, and commissioned officers or warrant officers while undergoing flying training: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, no officer of the Army shall be entitled to receive an addition to his pay in consequence of the provisions of the act approved May 11, 1908 (10 U. S. C. 803): *Provided further*, That provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to military and civilian personnel in and under the Military Establishment: *Provided further*, That, without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Army on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and harbor and flood-control appropriations and retirement deductions, may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1945 collections which otherwise would be for credit to an appropriation of the War Department which has reverted to the surplus fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That no collection or reclamation shall be made by the United States on account of any money paid to assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them, under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allowances made under authority of law where liability might exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allotments, or the use of such moneys, because of the death of the assignor, transferor, or allottee: *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any expense pertaining to (1) the instruction, education, or training of class IV-E conscientious objectors in colleges, (2) the service of such conscientious objectors outside the United States, its territories, and possessions, (3) the transportation of such conscientious

objectors to or from any college or any such service, or (4) the compensation of military or civilian personnel performing any services with respect to the matters set forth in (1), (2), or (3) above after the enactment of this act, except any services which may be necessary promptly to terminate any such class IV-E conscientious-objector college or foreign-service projects existing on the date of the enactment of this act;

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FITZPATRICK: Page 6 line 23, after the colon insert the following: "*Provided further*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military posts: For construction and installation of buildings, utilities, flying fields, fortifications, and appurtenances thereto, or other facilities required for military use and for each and every object and expense connected therewith, including (a) housing, storage, interior facilities, fixed equipment, piers, roads, railroads, communications, water, sewerage, and electric systems, (b) expenses incident to the preparation of plans, the purchase and installation of equipment, (c) the employment of persons and the procurement of supplies, equipment, printing, binding, communication service, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, at the seat of government and elsewhere, (d) the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, (e) the acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold, and other interests therein and temporary use thereof, and the land and interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended, and without regard to sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, (f) the settlement of claims resulting from the use and occupancy of real estate under the provisions of the act approved July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), (g) the payment of deficiency judgments and interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings heretofore instituted pursuant to specific acts authorizing particular projects, notwithstanding limitations of amounts contained in such acts, and (h) the salvage and conversion of military facilities, \$81,995,500: *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the acquisition of land without the specific approval of the Secretary of War, and then only when it would be more economical to purchase than lease, if leasing be possible, in cases where doubt prevails as to the land desired being permanently needed for military purposes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: Page 32, line 8, after the semicolon, insert "Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Secretary of War shall not be authorized to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of any land acquired or owned by the United States prior to July 2, 1940; nor shall he declare any such lands surplus for disposition by any other officer, board, or commission."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman going to explain the amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; I shall be pleased to explain the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to several members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. The situation arises in this form: Under date of July 2 Congress gave the Secretary of War the power to acquire lands without specific legislative authority and in that connection also gave him the authority to dispose of lands so acquired. The Second War Powers Act contains a provision for the disposition of surplus Government property. The question now arises that it is about to be asserted that under that provision, by the device of declaring lands acquired prior to July 2, 1940, all of which were acquired by specific legislative authority, by declaring them surplus then the organization headed by Mr. Will Clayton, surplus property disposition board or administration, would have the power to dispose of any land owned by the Army. There is an apparent attempt to dispose of two of the oldest military posts in the United States without any legislative authority. I take the position that should the Congress lose power to control these old military establishments, or all of the old military establishments, we lose entire control of the government of the Army and the Navy.

Inasmuch as this bill contains a great deal of legislation I felt that one more legislative provision would not detract from the bill.

Mr. POWERS and Mr. SHORT rose.

Mr. KILDAY. I must first yield to a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. All this amendment does is to put a little more power back into the hands of Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. I believe there are none of us on the Military Affairs Committee or Military Subcommittee on Appropriations who realized we were giving to the Department any semblance of power to dispose of old military establishments. If they have that power there is no longer any function for either of these committees.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman state the military establishments the transfer of which he believes this will stop?

Mr. KILDAY. The two cases to which I have reference are Fort Ringgold and Fort Clark on the Mexican border. Both these posts were established long before the Civil War. Fort Clark was established in 1852. It was an important cavalry post. I am not saying that the War Department is attempting to or proposing to dispose of these properties by the device of declaring them surplus. I do know that in other instances when troops have been withdrawn from stations they have been placed on a stand-by basis or

a housekeeping basis. In these two instances it has been announced that they have been declared surplus. It is my—well, I had better say suspicion—it is my suspicion that the device to which I referred is about to be resorted to for the purpose of disposing of these posts.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman state for what purpose the Army expects to declare these posts surplus?

Mr. KILDAY. For the express purpose of selling them; and they would be sold as grazing lands, as pasture lands, for almost a nominal consideration. Those who live on the Mexican border understand the situation and know that you had better not dispose of Mexican border posts because should the time ever again arise when we needed to garrison the border it would create many difficulties. We would, if necessary, be in a far better position to reestablish military garrisons on the border, should we have to. We had better keep what we have.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am rather sympathetic with the gentleman's viewpoint. The thing that concerns me, however, is that we have allowed the War Department to purchase a great deal of land for industrial and other purposes than the establishment of military posts.

In many cases we purchased considerably more land than we used. For instance, at Fort Knox we started to condemn on one side of Fort Knox for a tank center. Another general came in and condemned on the other side. Would this prevent the War Department from disposing of those?

Mr. KILDAY. Positively not. This provides they shall not have the right to dispose of any land owned or acquired prior to July 2, 1940, so that all of the lands that have been acquired for defense expansion prior to the declaration of war and all the lands acquired since the declaration of war are still under the absolute control of the War Department. It will only take into consideration those lands which were acquired by specific legislative authority and would prevent their sale without specific legislative authority.

Mr. CASE. I reserved a point of order, and I shall insist on the point of order, unless the gentleman will modify his amendment to provide that this shall not prevent the War Department from disposing of property where it is proposed to convert that property into Veterans' Administration facilities. I state this because of specific instances known to me where this is under way, and I cannot here on the floor be guilty of letting this thing lapse at the very time that the transfer is being completed. One such instance is at Fort Meade in South Dakota and I understand there are one or two others. The facilities are badly needed for hospitals at this time. It saves time, money, and materials to convert these Army posts where it can be done.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman that should be the case and I am willing to add such language as the gen-

tleman feels would be necessary to accomplish that purpose. I think perhaps where we provide they shall not be authorized to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of land it does not constitute a prohibition against its utilization by other Government agencies. However, I will accept whatever language the gentleman thinks is necessary.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman referred to stand-by fields. What does he mean by that?

Mr. KILDAY. That is a term that is used. I am not able to define it specifically. The Army does use that term. They leave housekeeping troops on the post to protect them, but it is not utilized for the garrisoning of troops.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman refer to these airports which were declared surplus and put in the standby category? Is that what the gentleman refers to?

Mr. KILDAY. There have been many of them in that category and there will be many more. Of course, we raised an Army to send out to fight and we are not going to keep these places garrisoned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I did not happen to hear the reading of the amendment, but, as I understand the gentleman's remarks, it will prohibit the sale of certain properties along the Mexican border?

Mr. KILDAY. No. It would prevent the sale without legislative authority of any lands owned by the Army prior to July 2, 1940.

Mr. MAY. The effect of that would be to cover those two posts that the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. KILDAY. And all others, of course.

Mr. MAY. Yes, and all others. The gentleman recalls that no longer ago than week before last the question came up in the House Military Affairs Committee and the Army has pending now, or the War Department, a general bill which would authorize it to dispose of real estate without coming to the Congress for authority to do so?

Mr. KILDAY. It is not that broad, as I recall it.

Mr. MAY. It is unlimited in its scope, as I read it, and the committee decided as a matter of policy it would not agree to any such thing.

Mr. KILDAY. Since our action on that bill these properties have been declared surplus by the War Department. I do not know what the reason was for coming to us with that request for authority if the authority already existed.

Mr. MAY. That is what they are doing in several instances in this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Texas has correctly stated the proposition. All his amendment does is simply to keep within the control of Congress disposition of land that was acquired before 1940.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. Instead of turning it over to somebody else to dispose of as they please.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHORT. As the gentleman from New Jersey has already pointed out, that is the whole thing.

Mr. CASE. Would the gentleman be willing to ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment by adding this language: "Provided, That this prohibition shall not apply to nor prevent the transfer of real estate or other property to the Veterans' Administration for the care and treatment of veterans?" If he will do so I shall withdraw my reservation of the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. I had practically the same language written out here.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to say "any other Government agency" because the usefulness of these properties might not necessarily be confined to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. KILDAY. If you do that, they might be transferred to a Government corporation which has the power to dispose of real estate.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct for the reason some of these stand-by fields have been offered to other Government agencies.

Mr. KILDAY. These stand-by fields are all temporary.

Mr. STEFAN. I know, but they have been transferred to other Government agencies. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. KILDAY. My amendment does not cover any of those. This covers only the old military establishments as they existed prior to expansion for the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, still reserving a point of order, will the gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by adding the language suggested by the gentleman at the end of the amendment I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the modified amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: Page 82, line 8, after the word "purpose" strike out the semicolon, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of War shall not be authorized to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of any lands

acquired or owned by the United States prior to July 2, 1940, nor shall he declare any such lands surplus for disposition by any other officer, board, or commission: *Provided further*, That this prohibition shall not apply to nor prevent the transfer of real estate or other property to the Veterans' Administration for the care and treatment of veterans."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. If at any time during the fiscal year 1945 the termination of the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," approved April 9, 1943, or of the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1943, shall be fixed by concurrent resolution of the Congress at a date earlier than June 30, 1945, the appropriations contained in this title shall cease to be available on such earlier date for obligation for the purposes of the terminated act and the unobligated portions of appropriations allocated for the purposes of such terminated act shall not be obligated for any other purposes of the appropriation during the fiscal year 1945.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the bill at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill has been on a uniformly high plane and all of it completely admirable, representing the common determination to prosecute the war as vigorously as possible, and without stint of anything required, to a successful conclusion.

But under the circumstances it is appropriate to single out for special mention the speech, at once analytical and brilliant, of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Alabama will not be a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Without questioning the judgment of the citizens of the district which he has so ably represented in this House for many years past—and here I recall the observation of former Senator Ashurst to the effect that the people of any State or district have the indisputable right to change their Representatives in Congress "for a good reason or for a bad reason or for no reason"—my great respect and admiration, not unmixed with affection, for the gentleman from Alabama impel me to pay my own humble tribute to him.

The Members of this House who have known him for the past 7 years and more are keenly aware of the outstanding quality and value of his service, especially as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the War Department. His high intelligence, his sincerity and devoted patriotism, coupled with his knowledge of military affairs gained as a valiant soldier in World War No. 1, have especially fitted him to deal

with all matters affecting military preparation and military action. During the course of his service he had occasion to visit the Territory which I have the honor to represent in this body. His instant and commanding grasp of military problems as affecting the Territory of Alaska has been most encouraging and helpful not only to Alaska but to the Nation. The speech which he made today may well serve as a model of condensed and illuminating exposition of problems of supply and finance involving the War Department, especially since the commencement of World War No. 2.

Nor should the occasion pass without comment upon the action taken, at long last, in this bill with a view of exploration for oil in the Wide Bay area of Alaska. This bill, as I understand from a reading of the hearings, carries \$1,217,000 for the Wide Bay development. Another bill will carry \$1,075,000 for the same purpose. In addition the Navy Department appropriation bill embraces \$1,000,000 to be used in prospecting for oil in the naval reserve which fronts on the Arctic Ocean. So, if the three bills with the sums mentioned are enacted into law the total amount available for oil exploration work in Alaska will amount to \$3,292,000.

These proposals are of outstanding importance. After all, it must not be forgotten that Alaska still lies on the short line, the Great Circle route, between the main body of the United States and the main body of Japan. At this moment on Attu Island we are as near to the heart of Japan and its capital—Tokyo—as we shall be in that long-desired day when we again have possession of the city of Manila. The distances between Attu and Tokyo and between Manila and Tokyo are almost equal, namely about 1,900 miles. In the Marshall Islands and in Biak, where we are closest to Japan by land which we hold in force in the South Pacific, the distance to Tokyo is about 2,600 miles. The finding of any considerable volume of oil in Alaska is, therefore, of much consequence to our whole war effort. The so-called miracles of production which have enabled us to attain our present military status from extremely small beginnings is a sufficient indication that if oil is found in Alaska it may be brought into use at an early date. In any event, we should know whether or not there is oil in commercial quantities in Alaska. Indeed, we should have made these explorations years ago. It is impossible to recapture lost time, but from this moment on I earnestly hope and, indeed, expect that the Alaska oil projects will be carried forward without a moment's delay.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 62 which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: Page 62, after line 22, insert a new section, as follows: "Sec. 22a. The application to the requirements of the War Department by the reappropriation of unexpended balances of prior years shall be deemed to be a compliance with so much of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 403, as amended, of the Sixth

Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as reads:

"Upon the withholding of any amount of excessive profits or the crediting of any amount of excessive profits against amounts otherwise due a contractor, the Secretary shall certify the amount thereof to the Treasury and the appropriations of his Department shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount so withheld or credited. The amount of such reductions shall be transferred to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to insert at this point an explanation in regard to the amendment just agreed to.

The above-quoted portion of section 403 (c) (2), as amended, of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, was inserted as an amendment in the revenue bill which recently passed. Inasmuch as amounts withheld by the War Department in connection with the renegotiation of contracts operated to reduce obligations prior to fiscal year 1945, and thereby increased the amount of unobligated funds which have been reported for reappropriation for fiscal year 1945 in lieu of a like amount of new appropriations, such reappropriation accomplishes the purposes, and thus in reality complies with the provision of section 403 (c) (2) quoted above.

The purpose of the above amendment is to avoid any uncertainty as to the availability to the War Department during fiscal year 1945 of the full amount of funds which are being reappropriated, and upon which a like reduction in the amount of new appropriations has been predicated, even though the amount reappropriated includes savings accomplished through the renegotiation of contracts.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point with a timely observation on the text of a provision on page 7 pertaining to the allotments of pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The following provision appears on page 7 of the bill in connection with pay of the Army:

That no collection or reclamation shall be made by the United States on account of any money paid to assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them, under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allowances made under authority of law where liability might exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allotments, or the use of such moneys, because of the death of the assignor, transferor, or allottee.

The purpose of this provision is to assure continued expeditious payment of allotments to dependents and remove doubt as the liability of banks for any portion of the allotment that might be

questioned because of the death of the soldier making the allotment.

There has been some expression of doubt from banks as to the advisability of their continuing to cash dependency benefits checks as freely as they have in the past. This doubt is based on the likelihood of the banks being held responsible for the amount of the check, should word be received, after the check has been cashed, that the soldier had been killed before all the money was due. If many of these cases occur, a dependent will be forced to prove the soldier is alive before the bank will cash the check. It is certain that upon occasion the allotter may have died or may have been killed on the field of battle on some date prior to the date when the check was actually signed. Any considerable delay in cashing checks for amounts made available by military personnel to their dependents would result in much complaint, not only from those whose dependents may have been killed but also from those whose dependents remain alive.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for including in the bill an appropriation of \$552,000 for architectural and engineering services in order to build additional facilities at the Military Academy at West Point at the end of the war. The Congress in its wisdom has authorized an increase of the cadet corps at West Point, and naturally it is necessary to have additional sums of money to provide for their living quarters, and necessary facilities. We are all agreed that West Point is the greatest military academy in the world; it has been proven in other wars, and it certainly has been abundantly proven in this war. Most of the great military leaders, except General Marshall and a few others, are graduates of West Point. Congress wants to be sure that it will continue to be the greatest military academy in the world. I am strongly in favor of preparing now for this post-war expansion and building program.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. When our committee recently visited West Point on an inspection tour, we looked all around for Congressman FISH but could not find him. We wanted him to go along with us on that inspection trip.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and am sorry I could not attend, but I am a great believer in the Military Academy at West Point and am proud to represent the district in which it is. The artisans and skilled labor and wage earners of Newburgh, Cornwall, and Highland Falls in my district have helped in the past to construct the fine buildings and facilities at West Point and I hope after the war will continue to do so.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I want to subscribe 100 percent to what the gentleman from New York has said. The present Commandant at West Point, Major General Wilby, is a particular friend of mine. He is doing an excellent job. However, I think we should go further. Since West Point is located in the East, I think we should have an East Point in the West. We need two, and not one, military academies. I mean that in all seriousness.

Mr. FISH. I just want to add to what the gentleman has said as I know Gen. Francis Wilby and have a very high regard for him. He is a great engineer officer and well qualified to handle the new building program at the Military Academy.

Mr. SHORT. I have known the general since he was a major. He is a high type gentleman, and a very efficient officer.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I certainly have no criticism of the gentleman's suggestion. I am for it, but when the gentleman says that it has supplied more great leaders than any other military institution, I want him to bear in mind that Texas A. and M. has furnished more officers to the United States Army and has more officers in the Army at the present time than any institution in the world.

Mr. FISH. I was talking about high-ranking officers, of course.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Whatever the gentleman says about West Point applies equally to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, that grand institution which has given us the naval leaders to win this war.

Mr. FISH. Certainly, I believe in letting the military and the naval leaders fight this war, and if we do, we will win it speedily if not interfered with by back-seat drivers at Washington.

Mr. SHORT. I do not want the gentleman from New York to forget my suggestion that we need an East Point in the West, as we have a West Point in the East.

Mr. FISH. I am not going to contend with the gentleman on that, but I want to insist that West Point be kept as the greatest military academy in the world and be given by Congress all the appropriations that are needed to maintain its high standards.

Mr. SHORT. I agree absolutely.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4967) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 357, nays 0, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—357

Abernethy	Carlson, Kans.	Ellison, Md.
Allen, La.	Carrier	Elmer
Andersen,	Carson, Ohio	Elston, Ohio
H. Carl	Carter	Engel, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Case	Engle, Calif.
Anderson,	Celler	Feighan
N. Mex.	Chapman	Fellows
Andresen,	Chenoweth	Fenton
August H.	Chiperfield	Fernandez
Andrews, Ala.	Church	Fish
Andrews, N. Y.	Clark	Fisher
Angell	Clason	Fitzpatrick
Arends	Clevenger	Flannagan
Auchincloss	Cochran	Folger
Baldwin, N. Y.	Coffee	Forand
Barden	Cole, Mo.	Fulmer
Barrett	Cole, N. Y.	Gale
Barry	Colmer	Gamble
Bates, Ky.	Compton	Gathings
Bates, Mass.	Cooley	Gavin
Beall	Cooper	Gearhart
Beckworth	Costello	Gerlach
Bender	Courtney	Gilchrist
Bennett, Mich.	Cox	Gillespie
Bennett, Mo.	Cravens	Gillette
Bishop	Crawford	Gillie
Blackney	Crosser	Goodwin
Bolton	Cunningham	Gordon
Bonner	Curtis	Gore
Boydin	D'Alesandro	Gorski
Bradley, Pa.	Dawson	Gossett
Brehm	Day	Graham
Brooks	Deaney	Grant, Ala.
Brown, Ga.	Dewey	Grant, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Dickstein	Green
Brumbaugh	Dillweg	Gregory
Bryson	Dingell	Griffiths
Buck	Disney	Gross
Buffett	Dondero	Gwynne
Bulwinkle	Doughton	Hale
Burch, Va.	Douglas	Hall
Burchill, N. Y.	Durham	Edwin Arthur
Burgin	Dworshak	Halleck
Butler	Eaton	Hancock
Camp	Eberharter	Hafe
Canfield	Elliott	Harris, Ark.

Harris, Va.	McMurray	Rowe
Hart	McWilliams	Russell
Hartley	Maas	Sabath
Hays	Mahon	Sadowski
Hebert	Maloney	Sasser
Heidinger	Manasco	Satterfield
Hendricks	Mansfield,	Sauthoff
Herter	Mont.	Scanlon
Hess	Marcantonio	Schiffler
Hill	Martin, Iowa	Schwabe
Hinshaw	Martin, Mass.	Scrivner
Hobbs	Mason	Shafer
Hoch	May	Sheppard
Hoeven	Merritt	Sheridan
Hoffman	Michener	Short
Hollifield	Miller, Conn.	Sikes
Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Mo.	Simpson, Ill.
Holmes, Wash.	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.
Hope	Miller, Pa.	Slaughter
Horan	Monkiewicz	Smith, Maine
Howell	Monroney	Smith, Va.
Hull	Morrison, La.	Smith, W. Va.
Jackson	Mott	Smith, Wis.
Jarman	Mruk	Snyder
Jenkins	Mundt	Somers, N. Y.
Jennings	Murphy	Sparkman
Jensen	Murray, Tenn.	Spence
Johnson,	Murray, Wis.	Springer
Anton J.	Myers	Stanley
Johnson,	Newsome	Starnes, Ala.
Calvin D.	Norman	Stefan
Johnson, Ind.	Norrell	Stevenson
Johnson,	Norton	Stigler
J. Leroy	O'Brien, Ill.	Stockman
Johnson,	O'Brien, Mich.	Sullivan
Luther A.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sundstrom
Johnson,	O'Hara	Taber
Lyndon B.	O'Konski	Talbot
Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal	Talle
Johnson, Ward	O'Toole	Tarver
Jones	Outland	Taylor
Jonkman	Pace	Thomas, N. J.
Judd	Patton	Thomas, Tex.
Kean	Peterson, Fla.	Thomason
Kearney	Pfeifer	Tibbott
Kee	Phillbin	Tolan
Keefe	Phillips	Torrens
Kefauver	Pittenger	Towe
Kerr	Ploeser	Troutman
Kilburn	Poage	Vincent, Ky.
Kilday	Poulson	Voorhis, Calif.
King	Powers	Vorys, Ohio
Kinzer	Pracht,	Vursell
Kirwan	C. Frederick	Walter
Knutson	Pratt,	Ward
Kunkel	Joseph M.	Wasielewski
LaFollette	Priest	Weaver
Lambertson	Ramey	Weichel, Ohio
Landis	Ramspeck	Wells
Lane	Randolph	Welch
Lanham	Rankin	Wene
Larcade	Reece, Tenn.	West
Lea	Reed, Ill.	Whittington
LeCompte	Reed, N. Y.	Wickersham
LeFevre	Rees, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Lesinski	Richards	Willey
Luce	Rivers	Wilson
Ludlow	Rizley	Winstead
Lynch	Robertson	Winter
McConnell	Robinson, Utah	Wolfcott
McCormack	Robson, Ky.	Wolfenden, Pa.
McCowan	Rockwell	Wolverton, N. J.
McGehee	Rodgers, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
McGregor	Rogers, Mass.	Woodrum, Va.
McKenzie	Rohrbough	Worley
McLean	Rooney	Wright
McMillan	Rowan	Zimmerman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—73

Allen, Ill.	Fay	Klein
Arnold	Fogarty	Lemke
Baldwin, Md.	Ford	Lewis
Bell	Fulbright	McCord
Bland	Fuller	Madden
Bloom	Furlong	Magnuson
Boren	Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.
Bradley, Mich.	Gibson	Marrow
Buckley	Gifford	Mills
Burdick	Granger	Morrison, N. C.
Busbey	Hagen	Murdock
Byrne	Hall,	O'Connor
Cannon, Fla.	Leonard W.	Patman
Cannon, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Capozzoli	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Curley	Heffernan	Price
Davis	Izac	Rabaut
Dies	Jeffrey	Rolph
Dirksen	Kelley	Scott
Drewry	Kennedy	Smith, Ohio
Ellis	Keogh	Stearns, N. H.
Ellsworth	Kieberg	Stewart

Sumner, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.	White
Sumners, Tex.	Wadsworth	Whitten
Treadway	Welchel, Ga.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Jeffrey.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Kennedy with Miss Sumner of Illinois.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Lempke.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Merrow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLANNAGAN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution facilitating the Republic of Iceland.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1479. An act providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1764) entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. DANAHY, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4559) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4070) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 35, 57, and 65 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 64 and 66 to the above-entitled bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of my testimony before the Labor Committee on the F. E. P. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SIKES, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. BENNETT of Missouri were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a brief valedictory address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement I made before the Labor Committee on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT (CIVIL FUNCTIONS) APPROPRIATION BILL 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 4: Strikes out provision for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a Federal agency other than the War Department, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Provides specifically for the purchase of vehicles used in the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Actual

Amendment No. 1, appropriating \$1,859,240 for cemetery expenses, instead of \$1,224,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, appropriating \$53,044,000 for rivers and harbors, instead of \$46,800,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5, appropriating \$400,100 for flood control, general, instead of \$100, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, authorizing the acquisition of mineral rights in a land area in Oklahoma needed for proceeding with the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project.

Amendment No. 8, relating to increased production of agricultural commodities that would be promoted by the use of any irrigation project or flood control or joint irrigation and flood control project.

Amendment No. 9, appropriating \$26,000,000 for flood control, Mississippi River and

tributaries, instead of \$25,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Pursuant to clause 2, rule XX

The managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses concurrence in amendments of the Senate, as follows:

Amendment No. 2, providing for advance planning of river and harbor projects heretofore or hereafter authorized.

Amendment No. 6, providing for advance planning of flood control (general) projects hereafter authorized.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement. Since the war occasioned stoppage of new river and harbor and flood-control projects, except those that would contribute to the war or that needed to be proceeded with to protect work already accomplished, the House has resisted efforts to provide for particular projects not falling in such categories, because any other course would be highly discriminatory.

There are many authorized river and harbor and flood control projects awaiting to be undertaken. Each should have priority, as determined by the Chief of Engineers and according to Budget estimates presented pursuant to such determination. To pick out this or that project up here at the instance of a Member of either body and give it a preferential status over a multitude of other projects waiting to be started or prosecuted on a larger scale than Budget estimates contemplate, is grossly unfair to Members, and by Members I mean practically every Member of this body, who have authorized meritorious projects in their districts which they consider to be just as important as projects which some Member, in either body, seeks to have given a preferential status.

Four of the amendments which we have brought back in disagreement apply to projects which some Member of the Congress is seeking to have accorded preferential treatment, or to have advanced over many authorized projects in a stand-by status.

The House conferees cannot be a party to such a practice. We cannot be a party to such an injustice to so many of our colleagues, and that is why we have brought the amendments back.

I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 3, strike out "\$1,224,000" and insert "\$1,859,240."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement I have just made as to the discriminatory nature of the Senate amendments adding money to the bill and inasmuch as these amendments are numbered 1, 3, 5, and 9, I ask unanimous

consent that they may be considered en bloc.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.
Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1.
Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANGELL moves to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate No. 1.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the shortness of the time I hope the Members will give me careful attention in the presentation of my motion.

Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 1 is an item of \$1,859,240 for cemeterial expenses. Included in it is an item of \$635,240 which is in disagreement. This is the amount necessary to begin the construction of a veterans' cemetery in my district. Two and one-half years ago, in fact on December 29, 1941, this House, the Senate, and the President all joined in a bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to build this cemetery. There are over 50,000 veterans of World War No. 1 in that territory, yet there are no burial facilities nearer than Montana and southern California.

The need for burial facilities is most important and urgent. For 2½ years after this cemetery was directed to be built nothing has been done because there are no funds. This item is the exact amount the Secretary of War stated was necessary for that purpose. I have his letter in which he said that \$605,240 would be required for initial establishment, providing for the superintendent's lodge, building walks, roads, and laying out burial sections, and so forth, including for the purpose of land approximately \$30,000, which is a very minor sum out of the \$630,000.

The Secretary of War has had the site examined and found it to be a suitable location and exceedingly well adapted to the purpose. All the veterans' organizations in my territory have been insisting for some 5 years that these facilities be provided; namely, the Spanish-American War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Order of the World War, the Gold Star Mothers, the American Legion Auxiliary, the Oregon State Guard, and many others interested in veterans' welfare. The burial of veterans is just as important as is the carrying on of the war. It is a war expense. We are providing for the burial of veterans overseas everywhere, yet there are absolutely no facilities anywhere in the vicinity of this great territory in the Pacific Northwest where any of these veterans can be laid to rest. As I say, there are over 50,000 veterans from former wars in this territory and many thousands are returning from the present war.

The Secretary of War said this in a letter to me:

The nearest burial space now available for deceased veterans of the Portland, Ore., area is in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, which is within a few miles of

Crow Agency, Mont., approximately 700 miles from Portland. The next nearest burial facilities are in the Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif., approximately 755 miles by rail from Portland.

It is realized that the distances involved would make the interment of the remains of Oregon veterans an expensive proposition for their families, and particularly so if the members of the families desired to accompany the remains and be present at the interment.

The Secretary of War also determined the amount necessary to carry out the purposes of Public Law 388, and on September 20, 1943, wrote Senator HOLMAN as follows:

In compliance with your request for information as to the proper language to be used in an appropriation bill which you desire to introduce, as well as an estimate of the amount of funds required, you are informed that approximately \$605,240 would be required for initial establishment to provide a superintendent's lodge, utility buildings, walks, roads, and to lay out and landscape burial sections. Should it be necessary to purchase land, approximately \$30,000 additional would be required. Should appropriation be accomplished by increasing the amount of the Budget estimate for the fiscal year 1945 under "Cemeterial expenses, War Department," no additional language would be necessary.

I hope you, my colleagues, here today will authorize this item. It is a war expenditure to provide decent burial facilities for our soldier dead. Providing decent burials for the dead is one of the first fundamentals of a great country, a great civilization; yet we in that great territory in the Northwest have no facilities closer than 700 miles. The Congress has heretofore directed that these essential facilities be provided.

Mr. Speaker, there is a bill pending in the House for the construction of a large number of veterans' cemeteries in the various States of the Union to provide burial facilities for death casualties of World War No. 2. This, however, should not in any way stop proceedings with the construction of the cemetery pursuant to the direction of Public Law 388, passed 2½ years ago, in the Portland area by reason of the complete lack of burial facilities there and the urgency of the early construction of the cemetery, which has not only been approved by the Congress and the President but the project itself has been investigated, surveyed, and examined by the War Department and the amount fixed by the Secretary for carrying forward the construction of the cemetery. Providing decent burial for deceased war veterans in their own homeland is a war expense on a par with expenses for prosecuting the war itself.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement, as a part of my remarks, by the military and naval affairs committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce:

JANUARY 12, 1944.

LET OUR HONORED DEAD REST IN THE HILLS OF HOME

A CALL TO ACTION ADDRESSED TO VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS, CHURCHES, AND OTHER CIVIC AND PATRIOTIC BODIES IN THE NORTHWEST

You are generally familiar with the history of the effort to secure establishment and maintenance of a national burying ground in

the Northwest for military dead of the Northwest. This memorandum of facts is prepared with the thought that it may assist you, and in the hope that it may stimulate you to take steps now toward bringing about Executive action to effectuate legislation already passed.

This is the law:

["Public Law 388, 77th Cong., ch. 640, 1st sess.]

"S. 793

"An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Ore.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Ore. The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act. "Approved December 29, 1941."

This is the present status of the law: Nothing has been done to carry out its clearly stated purposes. At the time the President approved the bill he wrote to the Secretary of War saying, "I am writing to you to indicate my view that under present conditions funds for land purchases should be limited to urgent defense needs and that in view of the burial space available in existing national cemeteries I would not expect that there would be a need for sending forward at any early date any estimate of appropriation under the authorization provided by this enactment."

This is the way leading journalists have felt about the matter, as indicated in editorials appearing in the Oregonian and in the Oregon Journal, of Portland.

The Oregonian said on July 3, 1942:

"Word has been received from Senator McNary that President Roosevelt, at the time he signed the bill authorizing the Secretary of War to establish a national military cemetery in Portland, sent a memorandum to the Secretary of War. In effect he stated that use of public funds for land purchases should be limited to urgent defense needs and that in view of available space in existing national cemeteries he would not expect there would be need for sending forward at any early date any estimate of appropriation under the authorization.

"The urgency in the matter as seen here is that the military cemetery site now owned by the State shall be consolidated with the national cemetery while additional suitable land for that purpose is still available.

"The State holding at Mount Scott consists of 5 acres given by Lincoln Memorial Park, formerly known as the Mount Scott Cemetery, and of 15 additional acres bought by the State. The State tract has been improved with the aid of W. P. A. labor, and together with the 195 acres proposed for Government purchase would constitute a cemetery site that has the approval and admiration of War Department officials.

"The State tract would be transferred to the Government, but there is apprehension that delay in buying the additional 195 acres may find the latter off the market, thus making the State's contribution unavailable and the alternative site, when purchased, perhaps much less beautiful and accessible, and possibly more costly.

"It is not pleasant to think about it, but the fact that there are burial plots available in other national cemeteries may be removed by the circumstance that we are engaged in global war. Whatever small consolation may be derived by having our own fallen sons laid to rest where we can visit

them in spirit and among beautiful surroundings should not be denied us to conserve the comparatively small sum now required for going ahead with the project. The land purchase calls for \$30,000. It is not much to add to the billions we are spending for war purposes. And one supposes, too, that our youth when called to dangerous duty would like to know that if they must return home without the breath of life within them, they at least will return home and not to some strange and distant plot, for their eternal sleep."

The Oregon Journal said on July 2, 1942: "To James McCarran of Scout Young Camp, Spanish War Veterans, Senator Charles L. McNary has telegraphed that the project of a national cemetery near Portland must be postponed, although the necessary enabling act has been passed 'unless the matter is shown to be urgent.' Which is to say that the Bureau of the Budget will, otherwise, withhold the \$30,000 appropriation for the cemetery, in order to divert no funds that can be applied to defense."

"When the case for the national veterans cemetery near Portland is reviewed, two facts immediately stand out:

"Short of Montana or San Francisco, there is no national cemetery available as the last resting place for Pacific Northwest veterans of America's wars whose services to their country entitle them to such honored repose."

"The veterans have themselves provided a 5-acre plot in the Mount Scott district, now fully occupied by nearly 2,000 graves of veterans. The State has purchased 15 acres more to present to the Government. But the formal option upon an additional tract large enough to meet Federal requirements has expired and is continued only by quickly terminable verbal understanding."

"The initiative that led veterans to make it unnecessary that their departed comrades be laid to rest in strange soil, far removed from the visits and floral gifts of the living who loved them, does honor to the veterans, calls for companion action by the Government. The boys of this region are fighting again for their country. Some may never return. Some may come back marked for death by the wounds of war and the diseases of tropical countries. For them, too, this gentle provision should be made. Delay should be rejected. The small allotment should be made."

This is the background of facts, leading to the enactment of the law that stands awaiting executive action:

A need for a national cemetery in this region was expressed about 4 years ago by veterans' organizations. Custer Field in eastern Montana, or San Bruno, south of San Francisco, are the closest of such cemeteries, whereas there were in Oregon, Idaho, Washington, Montana, and Alaska 155,000 veterans eligible on their death to be buried in a national ground—and this survey was taken before the present war. The great numbers of our armed forces now in service will obviously increase this estimate very greatly. Already it would be probably two-and-a-half times expanded.

The State of Oregon purchased some years ago a tract within Lincoln Memorial Cemetery, on the east side of Portland, for veterans' burial. The space is nearly all used and funds are inadequate for proper maintenance as burials increase.

The Governor of Oregon in 1940 appointed a special committee which made exhaustive study, contacted the War Department, found an appropriate site, secured its inspection and approval by the then Assistant Secretary of War, Louis Johnson.

The Oregon delegation in Congress gave cooperation at every point, and simultaneously bills were introduced in House and Senate, with Public Law 388 resulting.

The ground selected and approved is approximately 200 acres in area, immediately adjoining the State Veterans' Cemetery, on a gentle slope overlooking expanse of exceptional scenic beauty. The owners have without compensation held open informally for 4 years the option given when the site was selected by the committee. They have of their own volition reduced by one-quarter the price of \$40,000 that was set by the committee and contemplated by legislators when the bill was made into law. The price is less by a considerable amount than what the owners were charging when subdividing the tract previous to its selection by the cemetery committee.

The officer in charge of national cemeteries for the War Department, having inspected the selected site, commented most favorably on its advantages of location, scenic view, development possibilities, and in particular on the low cost of improvements due to the topography and cleared condition of the land. Other quartermaster officers expressed similar opinions.

This is what all citizens should ponder: A nation cannot long outlive the love of the people, and it is, therefore, important that any man who dies in veteran status should have the privilege of burial in a national ground not so far from his home surroundings that it cannot be known and visited by his kin.

This is what you can do, if you will: Make known at once, to your congressional delegation and to whomsoever in whatever ways you find appropriate, your feelings that adequate provision for burial of northwestern soldiers in a national cemetery located in the Northwest is a proper wartime action and a public duty that should by no means be postponed; and make known your support of our position that since this site has been properly selected and this Public Law 388 has been duly enacted by the Congress of the United States, there should be no further delay in the execution of its provisions.

Prepared and issued by the Military and Naval Affairs Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, in conference with representatives of the following organizations and groups, at a special meeting called for this purpose:

Spanish-American War Veterans, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of World War, Gold Star Mothers, American Legion Auxiliary, Presidents' Council, Oregon State Guard, Portland Americanization Council, Representatives of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths.

MILITARY AND NAVAL AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE OF THE PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

By QUINCY SCOTT, Chairman.

FRANKLIN WOMACK, Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., January 11, 1944.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of the House will be interested in the proposal of the gentleman from Oregon, because all Members of the House are vitally interested in the cemeterial program of the Army and of the Veterans' Administration.

Recently the War Department concluded a study and made certain recommendations with respect to the establishment of cemeteries in every State in the Union, and this report is in the hands of the Military Affairs Committee of the House. It is a matter that involves Texas; it involves all States. I think it would be very bad policy for us here at this time in the face of this report

and the forthcoming action along national lines affecting all States, to pick out a single project in the State of Oregon and say that in this case we are going to appropriate \$650,000 for a cemetery in Oregon.

This proposal is not in accord with the Budget; there is no Budget estimate for it. While I do not blame the able gentleman from Oregon—I can well sympathize with his interests in a project in his own State—there is no Budget estimate for this project.

We are in the midst of working out a big program involving the Nation, and we do not want to begin by setting a precedent of handling this national problem in a piecemeal manner. I appeal to you to stay with your committee on this item.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. This is not establishing a precedent. On December 29, 1941, we directed that this cemetery be built.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It should be of interest to note that there is a bill before the Military Affairs Committee authorizing construction of cemeteries on a State-wide basis throughout the country. A report has been made by the War Department, but the report is not entirely favorable. One should recall that in addition to the expense of the cemetery there will be a terrific annual expense for maintenance.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. I hope the House will wait until we can work out a Nation-wide program for cemeteries.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know anything about this subject, but I believe the gentleman is sound in his position. Has any similar burial establishment been provided heretofore for any State?

Mr. MAHON. It has not been provided in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman misunderstood me. Has Congress heretofore taken action on anything similar to this in the way of making an appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. None of which I have knowledge except the old established national cemeteries.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Was not the original action to which the gentleman refers prior to the time we got imbedded in the present war?

Mr. MAHON. It had its beginning prior to the time we became involved in the present war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why should we start out here piecemeal and mess up the whole business?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I understand from the gentleman from Oregon that Congress passed a bill authorizing and directing the acquisition and construction of this cemetery. I would like to have the gentleman's expression on that.

Mr. MAHON. There is no Budget estimate for this item, but there is specific legislation authorizing the project. I am not sure of the exact phraseology of the law with respect to the set-up of national cemeteries generally, but I would suspect there would be authority for the building of national cemeteries. But what we want is a national program, not a piecemeal method of handling these matters.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that there is authority for this, but that is not the question involved here, as has been so well said. The question is whether we are going to take 1 item and turn down 25 other Members on similar requests. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] what his question was?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wanted to know if Congress has heretofore authorized an appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. SNYDER. Not since Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; that has been authorized.

Mr. SNYDER. Not a dollar has been appropriated since Pearl Harbor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon prevails. This appropriation has already been authorized. On December 29, 1941, this bill was approved by the President after it had been passed by both Houses of Congress. It provides—

That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Ore. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

That bill was signed by the President on December 29, 1941.

Mr. TABER. What year?

Mr. RANKIN. Nineteen hundred and forty-one.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon told you that they are 700 miles from the nearest veterans' cemetery. I know it is contended that this has not been done in other States, but there is hardly a State in the South, in the East, or the

Middle West that does not already have a national cemetery, because in those areas there have been battles fought. Those cemeteries have been maintained and our veterans are buried in them. I think it is wrong to bury these men so far from their homes and families. If I had a son killed in this war, I do not care where he fell, I would want him brought home for burial where his people could see his grave and take care of it in the years to come.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Can we do any less for a man who has given his life to his country than to afford him decent burial?

Mr. RANKIN. No; and we cannot do any less for a mother and a father than to bring that boy's remains close to that home so that they can look after his grave. The Senate put this amount in, and I presume the Senate considered it as carefully as the conferees. I am going to vote for the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, whatever the House wishes to do with this is perfectly all right with me, but in order to keep the record clear, since the question has been asked as to whether or not we do have national cemeteries, it so happens that I have a list of them with me and I would like to read those that are presently authorized:

Pineville, La. (Alexandria); Alexandria, Va.; Andersonville, Ga.; Greenville, Tenn. (Andrew Johnson); Annapolis, Md.; Sharpsburg, Md. (Antietam); Fort Myer, Va. (Arlington); Leesburg, Va. (Balls Bluff); Baltimore, Md.; Fort Barrancas, Fla. (Barrancas); Baton Rouge, La.; Washington, D. C. (Battle Ground); Beaufort, S. C.; Beverly, N. J.; Springfield, Ill. (Camp Butler); Nicholasville, Ky. (Camp Nelson); Louisville, Ky. (Cave Hill); Chattanooga, Tenn.; Hopewell, Va. (City Point); Richmond, Va. (Cold Harbor); Corinth, Miss.; Indianapolis, Ind. (Crown Hill); Culpeper, Va.; Crow Agency, Mont. (Custer Battlefield); Brooklyn, N. Y. (Cypress Hills); Danville, Ky.; Danville, Va.; Fayetteville, Ark.; Salem, N. J. (Finns Point); Florence, S. C.; Fort Bliss, Tex.; Dover, Tenn. (Fort Donelson); Fort Gibson, Okla.; Richmond, Va. (Fort Harrison); Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; Maxwell, Nebr. (Fort McPherson); San Diego, Calif. (Fort Rosecrans); Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Fort Scott, Kans.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Fort Snelling, Minn.; Fredericksburg, Va.; Gettysburg, Pa.; Richmond, Va. (Glen Dale); San Bruno, Calif. (Golden Gate); Grafton, W. Va.; Hampton, Va.; Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; Jefferson City, Mo.; Keokuk, Iowa; Knoxville, Tenn.; Lebanon, Ky.; Lexington, Ky.; Little Rock, Ark.; Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y.; Baltimore, Md. (Loudon Park); Marietta, Ga.; Memphis, Tenn.; Mexico City, Mexico; West Somerset, Ky. (Mill Springs); Mobile, Ala.; Mount City, Ill.; Madison, Tenn. (Nashville); Natchez, Miss.; New Albany, Ind.; New Bern, N. C.; Perryville, Ky.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Petersburg, Va. (Poplar Grove); Zachary, La. (Port Hudson); Quincy, Ill.; Raleigh, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; Rock Island, Ill.; Salisbury, N. C.; San Antonio, Tex.; San Francisco, Calif. (Presidio); Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Richmond, Va. (Seven Pines); Pittsburg Landing, Tenn. (Shiloh); Sitka,

Alaska; Washington, D. C. (Soldiers' Home); Springfield, Mo.; St. Augustine, Fla.; Staunton, Va.; Murfreesboro, Tenn. (Stones River); Vicksburg, Miss.; Wilmington, N. C.; Winchester, Va.; Elmira, N. Y. (Woodlawn); Yorktown, Va.; Louisville, Ky. (Zachary Taylor).

The space in many of these is exhausted, and, of course, as the list shows, there are many States which have none. I understand that there is pending legislation before the Committee on Military Affairs to carry out a recommendation of the War Department that 69 new national cemeteries be authorized. I personally do not know whether this one in Oregon is among those 69 or not, but the question having been asked about existing cemeteries, I thought the facts should be before the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I very reluctantly oppose the motion of the gentleman from Oregon for one reason, and one reason only, and that is there is pending now before the Committee on Military Affairs a report just recently made by the War Department in which this program of building some 69 additional cemeteries is proposed.

For some time we have had various bills before our committee urging the building of national cemeteries, and we have refused to act on those bills because this study was pending by the War Department. In my own State we had land actually bought by the State of Alabama and given to the Secretary of War under the provisions of the general statute, and the Secretary of War declined to accept the gift from the State of Alabama, based upon this study that was being made. In the study which has been laid before us just within the last few days the cemetery that was proposed for Alabama is included. I do not know whether the gentleman's cemetery is included in the report or not.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I may say to the gentleman that this cemetery for which I am fighting today has been authorized and approved by Congress, and the bill has been signed by the President. The one the gentleman is speaking of is just in limbo; just proposed. I may say to the gentleman that this one is included and has been approved by the Secretary of War among those that are covered in the general bill to which the gentleman has referred. Why should we delay and throw the remains of our soldiers over the back yard and not give them decent burials?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think the gentleman's statement about throwing the remains of our soldiers over the back yard is quite fair, because we are not now bringing home the bodies of our soldiers from foreign battlefields. We still have ample space to bury those who are dying in this country today.

Mr. ANGELL. Not in our section; there are no burial facilities for veterans, many of whom are dying daily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the fair, reasonable, and orderly way of proceeding with this thing would be to wait and work the program out as a whole rather than piecemeal.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANGELL) there were—ayes 48, noes 101.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 6, line 2, after the word "harbors", insert the following: "for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 6, line 18, after the word "law", strike out "\$46,800,000" and insert "\$53,044,000."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 7, line 24, after the word "control", strike out "\$100" and insert "\$400,100."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 8, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "authorized flood control projects" and insert "flood control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 8, line 24, after the word "repealed", insert: "Provided, That the provision contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 320), concerning the acquisition of mineral rights owned by the Osage Tribe in

lands to be acquired for the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project is hereby amended by adding the following: 'Provided, That if just compensation cannot be agreed upon the Secretary of War may institute proceedings to condemn said mineral rights pursuant to existing laws: Provided further, That the construction of the dam may be commenced at any time after the institution of such proceedings'."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no money involved in this amendment. It involves what is known as the Hulah Reservoir in my district in Oklahoma, which is within the Osage Indian area. It is not exactly a reservation, but the mineral rights are owned by the Osage Indians. The Osage Indians retain all of their mineral rights in common. Part of the surface rights have been sold and a part of the surface rights still belong to the Indians. All of the mineral rights belong to the Indians.

Under the unusual language of the Federal procedure for the condemnation of land, condemnation of the land for the building of a reservoir, when the time comes when it can be built and when money becomes available for its building under general law cannot proceed, because the Osage Indian Tribe is a nation by itself and, besides, is under the guardianship and supervision of the Department of the Interior. So it becomes a problem of the War Department, technically the Board of Army Engineers, instituting proceedings in condemnation against the mineral rights and the surface of lands under the supervision of another department. The general law does not provide for that, so departmental legal authorities say.

This amendment permits condemnation proceedings to proceed under the particular circumstances. As I have said, there is no money involved. But condemnation proceedings will take some time.

Here is what is involved. The Indians have what the Army claims is an exaggerated idea of the value of these mineral rights. They want \$1,000,000 for the mineral rights. The Army feels that the mineral rights are worth far less. Since that cannot be agreed upon, condemnation proceedings must be had to make a determination of the value of these mineral rights, and that is all that is involved here.

Mr. POWERS. If the gentleman will yield, this is purely legislation. Why does not the gentleman go to the proper committee for his remedy?

Mr. DISNEY. It is here; it is before us, and I have not heard yet in my 14 years in Congress of an appropriation bill going through this House that did not contain some legislation, in nearly every instance.

Mr. POWERS. Of course, two wrongs do not make one right.

Mr. DISNEY. Why invoke it on me at this time under these circumstances?

I believe that is all I have to say about it. In all seriousness, now, when the time comes for the building of this project and the money is available, it ought to be done. Bartlesville, a city of 20,000, was for 3 days under flood this spring, without city water for 3 days. We ought to make progress on this, and here is the opportunity to do it. It costs no money to allow this condemnation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, this is a very unusual and peculiar situation, because the Osage Tribe has rights in the minerals underlying this dam.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. If the ordinary law of condemnation could apply, there would be no difficulty. It would not be here.

Mr. MONRONEY. There would be no necessity for any legislation.

Mr. DISNEY. None at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. The condemnation could go ahead?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is just that under these peculiar circumstances the Congress ought to take care of this matter and let the condemnation proceedings go ahead.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; let the condemnation proceedings go ahead. No money for the work is involved.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for the gentleman from Oklahoma. It is with extreme reluctance that I rise to oppose his motion to recede and concur. The sole question involved is whether or not the Committee on Appropriations shall undertake to legislate on a matter that seems to be in controversy. There may be much merit to the position taken by the gentleman from Oklahoma, but the Committee on Appropriations has no information on the subject matter, as it was not presented to our committee for consideration. It is not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. This matter should be presented to the proper legislative committee for consideration and action as it involves a change of policy in handling condemnation proceedings. Since the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee, I hope the House will vote down the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 41, noes 66.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House insist

on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 9, line 9, after the word "proceedings", insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That food is hereby declared to be a war necessity: *Provided further*, That whenever, during the period of the present war, the War Food Administrator determines that there exists or threatens to exist a shortage of agricultural commodities which are essential to the successful prosecution of the war, the War Food Administrator shall investigate any irrigation project or flood-control or joint irrigation and flood-control project which is under construction or the construction of which has been authorized, and for which funds have been appropriated, to ascertain if the completion of such project will increase the production of such agricultural commodities. If his investigation, in the light of the available manpower, material, and equipment, discloses that the project is feasible and the amount of increased production of agricultural commodities will warrant its completion, he shall make a finding to that effect and shall recommend, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, or, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, to the Chief of Engineers, that such project be constructed or completed: *Provided further*, That upon receipt of a recommendation made by the War Food Administrator, as provided herein, the Commissioner of Reclamation, or the Chief of Engineers, as the case may be, shall proceed as provided by law with the completion or construction of such project: *Provided further*, That in the case of any flood-control, irrigation, drainage, or joint irrigation and flood-control project referred to the War Production Board by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the War Food Administrator, the War Production Board shall have no authority to pass on the merits of said project but shall confine its jurisdiction over said project to passing upon the questions of the availability of materials and manpower: *And provided further*, That all agencies, departments, and bureaus of the Government are authorized and directed to assist the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers in all matters with respect to the completion or construction of any such project, to the end that the maximum supply of agricultural commodities may be produced at the earliest practicable date."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: On page 11, line 11, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, a motion was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

BOMBING OF TOKYO

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the dramatic announcement made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] during the course of his eloquent address on the War Department appropriation bill a few moments ago, it is now officially confirmed that American Super Fortresses flying from remote bases have successfully bombed Tokyo in a very heavy raid. It can be safely assumed that these were the new B-29's. The B-29's have in our strategic thinking made medium-range bombers of our famous Flying Fortress, the B-17, and the Liberator, the B-24, and short-range bombers of the B-25 and the B-26.

(I based this statement with reference to Tokyo upon the information furnished me by a general officer of the Army who gave me the official confirmation of the raid. I have no reason to retract it. My information was that Tokyo was one of two places bombed, the other being Yawata, as has been announced.)

The Twentieth Air Force has been organized as a strategic air force under the direct command of General Arnold, acting under the direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and will operate as a task force just as the mighty naval task forces are now roaming the Pacific Ocean seeking to bring the Japanese fleet out into the open and send it to Davy Jones' locker at the bottom of the sea. This is a new day in warfare. The B-29's will hasten the end of the war. The process of softening the Japanese mainland is now under way. It may be safely assumed that these planes approached Tokyo at an altitude of more than 30,000 feet and a speed of more than 300 miles per hour with the heaviest bomb loads and the greatest armaments of any airplanes in the world. The Navy Department has just announced that United States troops are landing on Saipan in the Marianas, within 1,500 miles of Tokyo. From this point our Super Flying Fortresses will soon be carrying the war to the Japanese homeland.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in thanking God for the wonderful news we have just heard, and I know we all do thank God, and in thanking the brave soldiers who made that news possible, let us also remember the men and women here at home working day and night on the assembly lines and in the factories of the Nation producing the implements of war to make this good news possible.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 589, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and pending that, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at some not distant date, and the shorter the distance the better, someone is going to rise on the floor of this House and announce that the war is over, with the sudden dramatic effect of the announcement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], when he announced the bombing of Tokyo. I hope that that time will not be a long way off. However, when that announcement comes we want to be ready for the events that will follow. I am sure anyone who has given a moment's thought to the effect of what that coveted moment is going to mean, realizes that when the announcement is made that the war is over over there, the telegraph wires are going to be busy going out of the

War Department to every corporation and every manufacturer in this country telling them to cease making airplanes, tanks, munitions, ships, and the other sinews of war. What is going to be the effect upon the economy of this country when that announcement is made? We have, all told, in excess of 50,000,000 people now employed in this country, most of whom are largely engaged in the manufacture of the sinews of war. When that announcement is made the wheels are going to cease to grind. Oh, it is going to be a happy day in this country when that announcement is made, but it is also going to be a great day of responsibility for the people of this country and those responsible for giving gainful employment to those thrown out of work when the wheels of industry stop turning. Now I know that is not as glamorous a subject to discuss as is the actual warfare. The Congress of the United States, you and I, have the duty to prepare for that day just as it was our duty to prepare for the day of warfare. And remember this, when that day comes—and it will come suddenly—and if we are not prepared to take up the slack in employment we may have another tragedy like Pearl Harbor, but on another front.

Mr. Speaker, at the first of this session you appointed an 18-man committee, known as the Special House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. One of the chief purposes of this committee, we thought, was to bring about a speedy reconversion of our wartime economy to a peacetime economy when the war was over. Therefore, one of the first subjects that our committee undertook to study was that of termination of war contracts, with the thought primarily in mind of full employment at the end of the war. This committee, composed of some of the ablest Members of this House, has given months of careful, sober consideration to the subject of legislation for the termination of these war contracts. We met frequently and heard all sides of the subject, including both capital and labor. As a result of these deliberations, we recommended what we regard as a fair bill which would do the job with speed, and at the same time protect the interest of the Government. This bill was agreed upon by the subcommittee and given the unanimous endorsement of the full committee. The committee instructed the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the chairman of the subcommittee, to introduce the bill. This committee not having legislative jurisdiction, the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary where it again was given full and careful consideration and by that committee unanimously reported.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to emphasize the importance of the speedy and final termination of these contracts when that day comes, so that the people of this country who are now engaged in that employment, and these soldier boys in whom we are so intensely interested, can secure employment once the war is won.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Referring to the speedy termination of contracts, what are you going to do with the war workers?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry; I did not get the significance of the gentleman's question.

Mr. WHITE. What do you propose to do with the war workers who are working on these contracts?

Mr. COLMER. We want to speedily terminate those contracts so that we can speedily reconvert from a wartime to a peacetime economy, and to give employment to the people thrown out of employment by the cessation of war activities, and give employment speedily to the returning soldiers.

There are two schools of thought on this matter, and we might just as well face it in the beginning. There are two schools of thought about how this should be done. One school of thought advocates that these contracts should be terminated speedily and finally, without any undue delay; without any so-called red tape; without the necessity for a prolonged preaudit. In other words, permit the people who made the contracts, the war agencies who are best familiar with those contracts, to terminate them promptly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'NEAL). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The other school of thought advocates a preaudit of all of these contracts by the office of the Comptroller General. I hope this question will be fully debated tomorrow, and I hope the Members of the House will give close attention to the advocates of both schools of thought, because we are all striving for one objective. The advocates of the other school of thought say we should have this preaudit; that we should go through and audit in excess of a million subcontracts and over a hundred thousand prime contracts. Now, that is fine. I agree with that, with but one exception. We all want to save the Government every dollar that can be saved. We want to see that the Government is fully protected, as far as possible, in the final settlement of these contracts. None of us have any interest in this matter except the common interest of the country. But I say to you, the Post-war Committee of the House, consisting of 18 Members from both sides of the aisle, representing a cross section of the country, say to you unanimously that that will so retard and slow up the reconversion that it would prove disastrous. The entire Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives says that would slow up and retard the orderly conversion and speedy termination of these contracts, without a dissenting vote in that committee. That great, learned, and elderly statesman, Mr. Bernard Baruch, and his associate, Mr. John Hancock, state in their report that if you did that it would twiddle this country into a post-war panic.

The other school of thought is sponsored by the able gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] the chairman of the

Military Affairs Committee of the House, and half of his committee—all splendid gentlemen. As against that you have the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and of the Post-war Committee of the House, and the additional fact that the Senate passed a similar bill without a dissenting vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman make clear the position of the Comptroller General with respect to these two schools of thought on this subject?

Mr. COLMER. I will be happy to do so. The Comptroller General appeared before a subcommittee of the Post-war Committee, dealing with this subject. In addition to that, the Director of the Post-war Committee and I went down and talked with the Comptroller General for some 2 hours on the subject before we came to any conclusion on the subject, and before the committee came to any conclusion.

I think it is fair to say, and if this is not true I hope some of those who talked to him may correct me later, the Comptroller General took the position that he either wanted to be into this picture fully and audit the whole thing, or he did not want to be in it at all.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I wonder if the gentleman would have any objection to my including in the RECORD at this point the minority views of the Committee on Military Affairs signed by 13 members, authorized under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. COLMER. I yield for that purpose but suggest that the gentleman put them in following my remarks.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Following the gentleman's remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. There are so many things about this bill I should like to call attention to if we had time.

So far as I know there is but one controversial phase of this question. I know there is going to be a lot of argument made here in the consideration of this bill just as has been made in other places that unless the Comptroller General is required to preaudit these contracts there will be fraud. I challenge that. I take the position that if that were true I would be the last person in the world to advocate the other side of the argument. Why do I say that? So far as I know I do not have a single war contractor in my congressional district who would be affected by this termination-of-contract legislation. I have but one interest in this matter—and I say now to those who belong to the other school of thought

that my mind is still open and if they can convince me of the superiority of their theory during the progress of this debate then I will join them. My chief interest is seeing that we have full employment and not a panic after the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Post-war Committee, who has been largely responsible for the formulation of this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Are the usual duties and responsibilities of the Comptroller General under existing law in anywise affected by this legislation?

Mr. COLMER. They are not, except to be augmented. The argument will be made here that we are taking the Comptroller General out of the picture. We are doing nothing of the kind. We put him in the picture even though he told us that he did not want to be in the picture unless he could be in all the way. We took the position that that was a matter for the Congress to decide, with all due deference to the able Comptroller General for whom we all have a great respect. We are not taking the Comptroller General out of the picture, we are putting him in there. We are doing more than that. After this bill passed the Senate these two committees, the Post-war Economic Planning Committee and the Judiciary Committee put every single safeguard in this legislation against fraud and corruption. Not only do we provide in this bill that if a contractor puts across a fraud or is convicted of putting across a fraud then he can be sent to jail for 10 years and be fined \$10,000, but we go further and say that if a man tries to perpetrate a fraud upon this Government by submitting a false or fraudulent claim even though he does not get one red cent, we penalize him 25 percent of the amount he claims he was entitled to. That is how far we have gone to try to protect the taxpayers against fraud in this matter. In other words, we have given the Comptroller General duties in this bill that he has not heretofore had.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert here the minority views of 13 members of the Military Affairs Committee in opposition to a bill on this subject, which was reported by that committee. This report was drawn through the able efforts of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] with, as I understand it, the complete approval of the War Department, and I know that these views have been confirmed by the actions of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] in reporting the bill be-

fore us today. This has my earnest support.

The undersigned members of the committee are fully in accord with the view that legislation on the subject of contract termination is necessary, to unify the procedures of the procuring agencies and to give them certain powers which they now lack. However, the provisions of H. R. 3022 insofar as they relate to the Comptroller General's part in the settlement of terminated contracts are subject to the most serious objections, which have made it necessary to file this statement of additional views.

Last fall the Comptroller General proposed to this and other committees of the Congress that all settlements of terminated contracts made by the procuring agencies be submitted to the General Accounting Office for review before they became final. Since that time, a great deal of testimony has been taken on the question. Almost without exception, the witnesses, representing both governmental departments and business and professional groups, have said that the Comptroller's proposal was unsound and impracticable, that it would interfere with procurement during the war, and that it would so seriously delay reconversion when peace came that it might be responsible for a major depression.

In the face of all this testimony, H. R. 3022 not only adopts the Comptroller's proposal but goes much further. By creating a board in the General Accounting Office with jurisdiction over the policies of the executive departments relating to contract termination and property removal, it wholly distorts the position of the General Accounting Office and divides responsibility between it and the war agencies in a way which is likely to interfere disastrously both with war production and with our return to peacetime manufacture.

THE SYSTEM PROPOSED BY H. R. 3022

The principal features of the system proposed by the bill are the following:

(1) The bill creates a war contracts settlement board in the General Accounting Office. It is to have not less than three nor more than nine members, to be appointed by the Comptroller General; and it will have power to establish regulations governing the contracting agencies in any matter related to contract termination and settlement, or to property removal.

(2) When any prime contract or subcontract is terminated, the contracting agency first endeavors to agree with the prime contractor or subcontractor as to the reasonably certain elements of his claim. If an agreement is reached, the contracting agency pays the contractor 100 percent of the agreed amount, and forwards to the board the settlement agreement (which remains tentative). If the board approves or fails to act within 6 months, the agreement becomes final. If the board disapproves, it returns the agreement, with its objections, to the contracting agency, which must endeavor to negotiate a new agreement avoiding the objectionable features. The bill does not spell out what happens in the event of failure to reach a second agreement.

(3) If the contracting agency and the contractor cannot agree as to all or any part of the claim, the contracting agency must pay the contractor 90 percent of its estimate (or the contractor's estimate, whichever is lower) of the disputed items. In addition, if the contractor shows that he needs the money and can repay it, the contracting agency must guarantee a bank loan in the amount of the 10 percent remaining unpaid.

Then, in the case of prime contractors, the contracting agency, within 60 days after request, must make its findings of the amount due. Within 90 days after receipt of these

findings, the prime contractor has the option to submit his claim to the board, or to a termination adjuster appointed by the board, or to arbitration, or to a Federal court. If he fails to do any of these things within this period, his sole remedy is the settlement of his claim through the General Accounting Office in the ordinary way.

The bill does not spell out what happens in the case of a subcontractor after he receives his 90-percent payment and 10-percent loan.

PROPOSED SYSTEM UNWORKABLE

The proposed system of settling terminated contracts is unworkable, for two main reasons: (1) It places a burden upon the proposed board which that board cannot possibly discharge; and (2) it effectively prevents the use of the negotiated settlement of termination claims, and will therefore indefinitely delay the settlement process.

1. The board cannot discharge its function: Sections 4 (a) and 7 (b) of the bill require the contracting agencies to endeavor to negotiate tentative settlement agreements on the termination of any prime contract or subcontract; and section 7 (b) then requires the submission of such agreements to the board for review.

The Under Secretary of War testified before this committee that the War Department alone had in effect more than 100,000 substantial prime contracts and more than 1,000,000 substantial first-tier subcontracts. The subcontracts of lower tiers, and the prime contracts and subcontracts of other agencies, would bring this to a much higher total.

No single board could effectively review settlements resulting from this vast number of contracts, in 6 months or a much longer period. Even with existing procedures, which have decentralized to field offices the authority to make final settlements, the War Department is having some difficulty keeping abreast of current terminations. The board, in practical fact, would be faced with one of three alternatives: Either it would have to allow the vast majority of cases to become final without any examination whatever; or it would have to resort to the most superficial kind of examination, which could only result in rubber-stamp approvals; or it would have to circumvent the 6 months' time limit by filing objection to settlements without any examination, holding them in suspense, and clearing up the objections over a much longer period of time. Any one of these results is highly undesirable. If the board makes no examinations or gives a rubber-stamp approval in most cases, it had better not exist at all; and if it secures the time needed for any action by extending the 6 months' period, it will create a disastrous bottle neck, which it is the very purpose of this legislation to obviate.

2. Negotiated settlements will be prevented: Section 7 (b) requires that all tentative agreements between the contractor and the contracting agency shall be submitted to the board for review; and section 7 (c) provides that if the Board disapproves any agreement, it shall be returned to the agency with the board's objections. The agency, must thereupon try to make a final agreement, with the contractor, containing (a) the original provisions so far as approved by the board, (b) new provisions meeting the board's objections, (c) and no others.

Under these rules, there will be no negotiated settlements. For a contractor would know, when he sat down across the table from a contracting officer to trade out the points on which they disagreed, that the negotiation was all to be one way. Whatever concessions the contractor might make would be

final; but whatever corresponding concessions the contracting officer might make could be taken back by the Review Board. In these circumstances, unless the contractor was desperate for immediate payment on any terms, there could be no advantage in negotiation; he would stand on his legal rights, and seek to prove to the Government's auditors that his entire claim had a valid basis. The result would be to substitute long-drawn-out auditing arguments for quick, final negotiations. Disposition of property would be held up until the Board had reviewed the case, because no prospective purchaser could be sure what price it would approve; and stagnation would result.

It was for reasons of this kind that almost every witness who has testified on this subject before this or other committees has been strongly opposed to allowing the Comptroller General to review termination settlements for any purpose beyond the discovery of fraud. There have been testimony and communications supporting this view from the Secretary of Commerce; from the Under Secretaries of War, the Navy, and the Treasury; from the Federal Reserve Board; from the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Automotive Council for War Production, the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, the Shipbuilders' Council of America, and various other industrial representatives; and from professional accounting sources, including the contract termination committee of the American Institute of Accountants, and the Journal of Accountancy.

More recently, objections to the Comptroller General's participation in termination settlements were strongly restated by Messrs. Baruch and Hancock in their carefully prepared report on contract termination. There is no substantial body of business or professional opinion that favors control of termination settlements by the Comptroller General.

It is no answer to these arguments to say that H. R. 3022 provides for quick payment to the contractor, on a tentative basis, of a high percentage of what the Government owes him. Even this may be doubtful, because of the extreme administrative difficulty of making direct payments to all prime contractors and subcontractors. But, assuming that quick tentative payments can be made, they are insufficient to meet the need. Prompt finality of transactions is also essential.

Property has to be sold in contract terminations. Buyers will not buy unless they can know the price with finality. If the price is subject to change 6 months later by a review board, prospective buyers will go elsewhere. Many contractors who finish their war production will have to reconvert their plants to reenter the peacetime market. They cannot and will not do this until they know finally where they stand, and how much of the money paid to them is theirs and how much the Government's. The bill does not make it clear how far prime contractors are to go in settling with their subcontractors. If this is to be done at all, a prime contractor may be able to get quick final approval of a proposed subcontract settlement; otherwise he will let his subcontractors wait for their money until the Board finishes with his case. Finality is just as important to contract termination as speed; and the system proposed by H. R. 3022 utterly fails to provide for it.

H. R. 3022 PROPOSES UNSOUND DIVISION OF AUTHORITY BETWEEN GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AND EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There is another equally fundamental reason why the proposals of H. R. 3022 are dangerous, so far as they clothe the Comptroller General with power over contract settlements.

The executive departments are now charged with the responsibility for contract termination as an integral part of their responsibility for procurement of war munitions. Section 6 (b) of the bill proposes to transfer authority over contract termination policies to a board to be established in the General Accounting Office.

This is a radical change in the relationship between the General Accounting Office and the executive departments, for it divides between them authority over war procurement. The General Accounting Office was intended to be an agency independent of the executive departments and responsible only to Congress, charged with the duty of overseeing the expenditure of public funds and reporting to Congress on these expenditures. It was never intended to be a policy-making body, nor to be vested with authority to direct the actions of the executive departments in carrying out their statutory responsibilities. It was never intended that the Comptroller General should exercise appointive authority over officials who would make rules and regulations binding upon the members of the President's Cabinet.

To change this concept, as proposed by H. R. 3022, would introduce into our form of government a wholly unsound division of responsibility for essential governmental functions. Fundamentally, the President and, under him, the heads of the executive departments are responsible for the discharge of the functions of the executive departments. They cannot do this if their activities are to be controlled by policies established, not by Congress, but by an agency independent of the Executive and not responsible to him. The proposal violates the fundamental theory of our form of government.

Such a division of authority would be unsound at any time; but, in the present state of affairs, it has two particularly dangerous aspects. During the war, it would deprive the armed services of control over an essential aspect of war procurement; and, when the war is over, it may disastrously delay reversion to peacetime activities.

It may not be generally realized how intimately contract termination is related to the continuing procurement of other needed war supplies. At the present time, when we are still facing the major battles of this war, the War Department has already terminated a larger face value of contracts than it canceled at the end of the last war. This has happened during a period when our production schedules are still rising, and is due to the fact that the shifting needs of war changed the character and quantities of supplies that have been needed. Canceled contracts were promptly replaced by others for different materials, and this process will doubtlessly continue until the war is over. The time and method of terminating such contracts, the speed of payment, and the interim financing to be given to the contractor, are all, therefore, closely bound up with his ability to continue in war production. To divide authority in this field between the General Accounting Office and the armed services who are responsible for war procurement is unwise and dangerous.

When peacetime comes, the need for a system which will operate quickly and smoothly is no less great if we are to avoid a major depression. At that time, the personnel of the procuring agencies will alone have the necessary experience and organization to do the job promptly and efficiently; and divided authority would be just as harmful then as during the war.

SYSTEM PROPOSED IN BARUCH REPORT WILL BETTER SERVE NATIONAL INTEREST

It is very clear that H. R. 3022 proposes a dangerous experiment in divided authority

which is likely to slow the settlement process down to a walk. The reason advanced for making this change in the existing system is that the public interest so requires; that the procuring agencies which made the contracts cannot be trusted to settle them; and that a third person must review each settlement to protect the public purse.

The system of contract settlement proposed by the Baruch report is far better designed to protect the true interest of the public.

The staffs of the procuring agencies consist not only of highly competent personnel of the regular staffs of the Army and Navy and other agencies, but of business and professional men recruited from the best available sources. These men have placed the contracts and administered them. They have built up a vast store of knowledge about the contractors with whom they have dealt; and they have acquired and are acquiring a fund of experience in the technique of handling contract terminations. No better qualified personnel can be found to do the job. The procedures governing contract terminations can be refined and improved so as to provide ample protection for the taxpayer's interest. The Baruch proposal is that negotiated settlements should be made by teams of experts, in which negotiators are assisted by legal, accounting, engineering, and other technical personnel; and that adequate records should be kept, which the Comptroller General and the Attorney General would be free to examine, to detect and punish fraud or collusion.

We have entrusted to the procuring agencies complete responsibility for the placement of contracts for war supplies. United States munition production has recently been running at a rate between five and six billion dollars per month. Expenditures for completed munitions of war will exceed by many times the amounts which will be involved in termination settlements. The termination of a procurement contract involves essentially the making of a new contract calling for a smaller quantity of the product and a lesser expenditure of money than the original agreement. Those whom we have trusted to do the larger job can certainly be trusted also with the smaller one.

What the Baruch report recommends is not a radical change in our established system of settling terminated contracts, but rather the improvement and perfection of the way in which the job has always been done. The contracting agencies have always exercised authority to settle the contracts that they have made. Since this war began, the War Department alone has terminated more than 19,500 prime contracts and settled 14,000 of them. The uncompleted value of the settled contracts was about \$3,900,000,000, and the amount expended in settlement was about \$85,000,000.

In the making of these settlements, a vast fund of experience has been accumulated; and procedures are being developed, under the recommendations of the Baruch report, for the speedy and satisfactory handling of termination claims. A uniform termination article has been announced which has for some time been required in all new contracts and which provides for the making of final negotiated settlements.

The provisions of H. R. 3022 would cut across and completely confuse existing procedures. They would cast doubt on the rights under existing contracts containing the uniform termination article; they would probably require that a different termination article be used in the future; and they introduce into the picture a new board in the General Accounting Office, whose staff, even if it could be recruited at all under existing conditions, would be completely without knowledge of the problems involved.

For the reasons given the undersigned members of the Committee cannot approve H. R. 3022 in its present form and propose to offer amendments which will effectuate the recommendations of the Baruch report.

MATTHEW J. MERRITT.
JOHN M. COSTELLO.
JOHN J. SPARKMAN.
PAUL J. KILDAY.
CLIFFORD DAVIS.
JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN.
W. G. ANDREWS.
L. C. ARENDS.
CHARLES R. CLASON.
J. PARNELL THOMAS.
THOS. E. MARTIN.
J. LEROY JOHNSON.
CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps as important a bill as has come before this session of the Congress. Committees of the Congress have been working on similar legislation for the past 6 months, the Military Affairs Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, and the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. The House authorized the creation of this special committee to deal with the settlement of post-war problems. I have the honor to be the ranking Republican member on that committee. It has been holding sessions almost daily for the past 2 months. It has a very expert staff. It engaged Mr. Marion B. Folsom, the treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co., of Rochester, N. Y., as its adviser and director. Mr. Folsom is a man of outstanding ability, progressive and forward looking, and has been giving his undivided time to this legislation. It comes to you with the unanimous report of the Post-war Committee; it comes with the unanimous report of the subcommittee which also held numerous meetings on this bill.

As a result of these hearings extending over many months a bill was agreed on and although we have no right to report legislation to the House, a member of that committee, a very distinguished member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who is also a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, introduced a bill. It went to the Committee on the Judiciary. They considered all the bills, that from the Committee on Naval Affairs, the one from the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Senate bill as amended by Mr. WALTER. Finally the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] agreed to take his name off the bill and substitute his bill for the Senate bill; so it is really the Walter bill imposed on the Senate bill that has been reported out and is now before you with an open rule permitting any germane amendment. It is really the Walter bill recommended by the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee with a few minor amendments made by the Judiciary Committee.

I wish to take this time to answer some of the criticisms in the press that there has been undue and unnecessary delay. There has been no delay what-

ever by any of these committees. They have given more time to the consideration, the detailed consideration of this legislation than has ever been given to any bill in the Congress in recent years. Actually three committees have been working on it for months. The following is part of an editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram a few days ago:

War contract cancellations and cut-backs will affect an increasing number of plants from now on. If Baruch-Hancock recommendations continue to be ignored this country will pay a heavy and needless penalty in waste of public funds, shortages of civilian goods, delayed industrial reconversion, unemployment, and adversity.

There is really no truth to that statement or to any of the loose charges that there has been any delay. All of these committees, regardless of what the Congress does—all of these committees have been trying to write constructive legislation to terminate war contracts and to solve this post-war problem affecting the employment of labor after V-day.

Behind it all is one objective, to put 11,000,000 soldiers who will return back to work and 11,000,000 additional war workers who will be demobilized out of the war factories. That is the purpose of the present legislation. Speed is of the essence. There has been no delay and will be no delay in getting this vital piece of legislation enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, it is now before the Congress and I hope it will be passed by the House tomorrow and sent to conference, so that we will be able to get it through both the House and Senate before we leave here on the 23d of June. I admit that there has been some delay in writing legislation to dispose of surplus war supplies but that has not been the fault of the committee but rather of the administration and that bill will now have to wait until after we recess.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. When we come to general debate, I will tell the gentleman who delayed it.

Mr. FISH. I do not think there has been any delay in the consideration of legislation to terminate contracts. Of course, the gentleman will have ample time to make any statement he wants in general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. I have known him for many years. He is one of the ablest and most experienced men in public life today. He, more than anyone else, originated the post-war economic program, particularly as it affects the cancelation and termination of contracts and disposal of surplus material with the able assistance of Mr. John Hancock. Mr. Baruch is a wise old owl if there ever was one, and has plenty of vision and foresight based on practical experience. He is known to most of us

as an elderly statesman who anticipates difficulties and helps steer the ship of state away from uncharted schools of confusion and chaos. He has had experience that no one else in this country has had from the last war. He is utterly unselfish, and has no ax to grind. All he cares for is the welfare of the country and the solving of these economic problems so that the returning war veterans can be put back to work, as well as those who will be demobilized by the millions from war factories. We want to expand private industry to take care of these millions of American men and women; to give them jobs and maintain a program of expansion, employment, and prosperity. That is all he is after, and he asks nothing for himself except the thanks of a grateful country. I submit however that any criticism on his part as to delay is entirely unjustifiable, and I say that as one of his friends and admirers. I am here to state the facts in regard to the work these committees have been doing, particularly the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, of which I am a member.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the million or so contracts are tied up by any process of auditing for several years, we never will get any reconversion and we never will get this reemployment that the gentleman spoke about.

Mr. FISH. That is why we have this termination-of-contracts bill before us today. We do not bring the Comptroller General in and require him to make pre-audits, because we are fearful if there are pre-audits, it will be interminable and might run for several years.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here without any prejudice whatever and am supporting the pending bill because I am convinced it is the soundest and best solution of the problem. The members of the subcommittee will talk about the details of this bill. I want to emphasize, however, that the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee leaned over backward to make the provisions dealing with fraud and attempted fraud far more drastic than was written into the Senate bill. The members went to the extreme, as they wanted to get a bill that was workable but at the same time would protect the interests of the public and expedite the settlement of these contracts both for the prime contractor and for the subordinate contractors. This is the whole purpose of the bill. The committee has taken care of the question of fraud and attempted fraud, as will be pointed out later; therefore, I will not say anything more about it now in order to save time.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Baruch had this to say only yesterday: "For the good of all of us, but mostly for the sake of our soldiers and sailors, let us hurry, hurry, hurry, not only in winning the war but in being ready for the peace. Delays jeopardize both of these objectives."

Mr. Speaker, the Congress, in my opinion, will pass this bill tomorrow and it will be enacted into law within a week. Perhaps Mr. Baruch has not been informed, perhaps he thinks we are going to recess for 5 or 6 weeks without acting upon this legislation. I can assure him, however, that it is the intent of the entire Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, to get action on the bill tomorrow, so far as the House is concerned, and send the bill to the President next week. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, that criticism is not fair to the Congress. Actions speak louder than words.

I want to emphasize to the Congress that there are three major problems facing America today. One is in the immediate process of being solved. That is winning the war. We know that we will win this war. We hope and believe that we will win it in Europe this year and next year in Japan. I have just heard, and I am proud to say it, that the Twentieth Bombing Squadron has just bombed Japan. I hope they will bomb the hell out of Tokyo and Japan, as it would be retribution of justice for what the Japs did to our captured pilots who previously bombed Tokyo.

The second problem to solve is the peace. That is something we are unable to do at the present time. There is not a Member of Congress who could not talk an hour on that subject, but he would contribute nothing in the hour because we cannot solve the problem until we win the war and know the peace aims of Soviet Russia and the British Empire. If we try to solve it before then, we are merely wasting our time. We will have to know their war and peace aims first before we can reach any agreements.

The third problem before us, and this is part of it, is solving the post-war economic problems of our own country in order to preserve our free institutions, preserve private enterprise, and to employ American wage earners. That is something we can do now, and we are in the process of doing it.

I hope the House will not spend too much time trying to amend this bill and make it impossible through further delays to cancel these contracts with the speed that will be needed to convert our war industries to peacetime requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, because of its worthiness and in order to permanently preserve it, the address of Archbishop Edward Mooney titled "Anti-Semitism Directly Opposed to Christian Teaching."

The archbishop deals most eloquently and forcefully with a subject of fundamental import to all Americans, Catholics and Protestants alike.

The address appears in the issue of the Michigan Catholic under date of June 8, 1944.

I ask, that notwithstanding the fact that the cost of printing may exceed the

minimum under the rule, the address may be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], who is a member of the committee and also the Subcommittee on Termination of Contracts.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that can come before Congress at this time of greater importance than the problem of reconverting our Nation from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy.

I do not mean to infer that we have arrived at a point where it is unnecessary to continue our effort to meet every need of our armed forces. While we have made great military advancement, yet the fact remains that we are not yet victorious. There must be no let-up in our effort, either military or legislative, until final and complete victory is achieved.

But the time is at hand, and the announcement just made to the House of the successful bombing of Japan emphasizes it, that requires us to think of, and provide for, the problems that will immediately arise upon a cessation of war activities. The problems we will then face will be serious and their proper solution vital to the immediate and future welfare of our Nation. Preparation to meet them should not and cannot longer be delayed. We were unprepared when war came upon us. We must not be unprepared for peace. If we are unprepared it will result in an economic condition that will not only be serious in its consequences but could easily become chaotic.

This possibility and the need for immediate action to prepare against it has been recognized by business leaders in every line of peacetime activity and by labor leaders. All of them recognize the necessity of immediately providing appropriate legislation.

This House has already recognized the importance of the question by appointing a Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, a committee upon which it is my privilege to serve under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

This committee has worked faithfully and well to fulfill the responsibility placed upon it. We have had before us some of the most outstanding leaders of business and labor. We realize that the time is short and the need for speed is pressing. What is to be done must be done quickly or the problem will be ahead of us and its solution more difficult.

While the committee has ever been cognizant of the necessity for speed, yet it has not failed to give careful and serious consideration to the recommendations it has made and the legislation that is necessary to make its recommendations of practical value.

The legislation which this rule makes in order, namely, a plan for speedy determination of claims originating out of

cancellation or termination of war contracts, is the first of a series of bills that will be offered to the House.

The bill is based upon the recommendations made and the views expressed in the Baruch-Hancock report. It is not greatly dissimilar to the bill already passed by the Senate. It has had the careful study of the special committee appointed by the House and by the Judiciary Committee of this House. It has had the unanimous approval of the special committee, and I understand with a few changes likewise has the unanimous approval of the Judiciary Committee. I therefore ask your approval of this rule and the bill that will follow.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], the chairman of the House Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy, has just stated that he does not have a single war contract in his district and, therefore, is entirely free from local pressure in the consideration of this legislation. I am sure that local interest would not swerve the gentleman from Mississippi against what he believed to be for the best interest of the country. As chairman of his special committee, he has given great study to this whole problem and the fact that he is supporting this bill 100 percent is proof, not only of his statesmanship, but also of the merits of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am just in receipt of a telegram from one of my leading constituents which reads as follows:

Early passage of Walter contract-termination bill vitally essential to Michigan industry. Michigan, as you know, has more war contracts than any other State. Ninety-six percent of our industries has been converted to war. This legislation must be passed soon to avoid a lot of unemployment complications. I am sure you already know the importance of this measure to Michigan. The manufacturers of Michigan beseech your support.

It will, therefore, be observed that the people in my State are vitally interested in speedy war contract termination. When it is realized that approximately one-half of the total goods and services produced at the current high rate of production are for war purposes, and that about two-thirds of all persons now employed in manufacturing are engaged in war work, the over-all picture of the importance of this problem is presented.

The volume of our war production from July 1940 to the end of 1944 will total about \$205,000,000,000, of which \$130,000,000,000 represents the production completed by the end of 1943, and \$75,000,000,000 is scheduled for completion in 1944. The number of prime contractors is somewhere between 100,000 and 250,000. The survey made in September 1943 showed that there were 105,000 contracts for \$50,000 or more held by approximately 17,000 establishments and another 100,000 smaller contractors. The number of subcontracts is very large and is undoubtedly well over a million, and this includes at least 70,000 establishments, large and small.

I give these figures so that you will have some idea of the enormity of our problem.

Now, this war is going to be over some of these days and when an almost complete economy must be immediately changed from war production to peacetime production the necessity for action now is apparent. Yes, there will be difficulties regardless of any law passed or any action taken by the departments. We can only seek to reduce those difficulties to the minimum. Time is of the essence, and speed is essential if we are to avoid the business stagnation, the unemployment, and everything incident thereto which is found to follow when war contractors are directed to proceed no further with the contracts. When those notices are given by the Government chaos will prevail unless the contractors—and especially the smaller ones, including the subcontractors and all down the line—are able to settle with the Government and with the prime contractors and know just where they stand financially.

This bill aims to alleviate this situation and, in my judgment, will be most helpful. I wish it were possible for every one of you to visit just a few of Michigan's great peacetime automobile plants and see the change. All the old machinery is gone, the assembly lines have vanished, and in their place is equipment for the manufacture of war airplanes, tanks, and other implements of war. Hundreds of thousands of people are working night and day in the war industries, and just the minute word comes from Washington that this production is to cease, these plants will be idle, people will be unemployed, and a great depression is bound to settle upon the country until peacetime economy is resumed. The one purpose of this bill is to make such condition impossible and to shorten to the limit that period of dislocation that is bound to come.

Mr. Chairman, unless reconversion is accomplished speedily and with finality, we will have the longest bread lines in our history.

Numerous illustrations have been given throughout this debate to show the difficulty in terminating these contracts. To make the nature of the problem perfectly clear, I would like to make use of a very simple illustration.

When termination occurs, the Government and the contractor will find themselves in somewhat the following situation:

Let us suppose that you had contracted for the erection of a 10-story building and that when 5 stories had been more or less completed you were to tell the general contractor to stop work. You would then have to come to some agreement with him as to fair compensation for what he had done, for the materials on hand and ordered in anticipation of complete performance, and for the obligations which he had incurred to his various subcontractors and suppliers. He in turn would have to come to an agreement with his various subcontractors who had undertaken to supply the steel, the masonry, the plumbing, the heating, the lighting, the air conditioning, the woodwork, and the hundreds and

perhaps thousands of other items entering into the construction of such a building. Perhaps there would be 100 or perhaps 200 subcontractors and suppliers. A settlement would have to be made with each one of these.

In arriving at these settlements, agreements would be entered into for the retention of some of the material and parts which the contractor might be able to use in his regular business and which he might be willing to retain and credit upon his claim at some agreed price; agreements for the sale of some of the material to others at a price which you, the owner, would approve; agreements that some of the material should be scrapped and the salvage value applied in the reduction of the contractor's claim; and agreements as to what parts should be turned over to you, the owner. And similar agreements would have to be entered into with subcontractors and suppliers all down the line.

Now suppose that you had contracted for a million such buildings and you were to stop work under all these contracts at different stages of completion. You would then be in a situation similar to that of the Government upon a general termination of war contracts. A similar series of settlements will have to be made with war contractors and suppliers doing over one-half of all the business of the country.

I think we are all pretty well agreed as to the objective and the efficacy of the bill. There is apparent disagreement as to the agency to be charged with the responsibility of settling these contracts. The real crux of the argument seems to be whether the Comptroller General should be required to audit all contracts and subcontracts ad infinitum before a final settlement can be had and before any of the contractors know just where they stand. The Comptroller General is a most estimable gentleman. He always does a good job, and if given these additional burdens would do a job limited only by his facilities and time. The answer is that his facilities are inadequate and that we do not want to let Rome burn while a bunch of bookkeepers and auditors fiddle over the small details in connection with these contracts.

Yes; there may be some mistakes made. There may be some unwarranted profits allowed on some of these contracts. This bill, however, places a very stiff penalty on fraud or wrongdoing on the part of the contractors in connection with the settlements. Then, we must not forget that after the settlement, the contractor is again visited by the Government tax collector and the rates are so high, and the rules and regulations so rigid, that it is just going to be impossible for these war contractors to get away with profits as was done after the last war. There are dishonest people in the world; yet, by and large, most of our contractors are honest, honorable men. This is a case where, if post-war economic catastrophe is to be prevented, we must trust somebody. This bill places limitations, standards, and guides, around these settlements, and with the

fraud penalties, I have little worry about great loss on the part of the Government. Undoubtedly the Comptroller General, if given years to check up, will find some unintentional mistakes of a minor nature. However, we must not here today adopt a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy.

There is no partisan controversy here, no conflict between different branches of the Government. There must be a combined, unified cooperative effort to bring about this reconversion at the earliest possible time, and in the soundest and most practical way. While this bill is far from perfect, yet it has had unlimited study and has the recommendation of the business interests of the country, several House and Senate committees, and such disinterested students in matters of this kind as Messrs. Baruch and Hancock.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this bill as reported by the committee with no crippling amendments. If the results contemplated are accomplished the people will in the end rise up to thank us. On the other hand, if we quibble and hesitate and the bread lines come, and the unemployed walk the streets, and the manufacturers go bankrupt, we will be justly condemned. The Congress is thinking about taking a short recess and I want the record to show that I consider this legislation so vital that I shall protest against any recess until contract termination has cleared the House and the Senate and been placed on the President's desk for his signature. That is what the country wants. That's what it has a right to expect of us.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], a member of the subcommittee of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee that handled the contract-termination legislation.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, it is quite characteristic of the splendid judicial attitude of my chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], of the Post-war Committee, to say that he still has an open mind in regard to the matter of possible post-war audits of terminated contracts by the Comptroller General. I am frank to say that I am fully convinced and my mind is quite closed on that subject.

For a year now I have been giving a good deal of study to this situation, and I do not see how it would be possible to make a final termination unless you terminate. Hundreds of millions and billions of dollars have been expended by the procurement officers of the Government. They have done a splendid job. I know of no cases that have been brought up where there has been an accusation of anything except the honest handling of the people's money. These same procurement officers are going to terminate the contracts which they themselves have made, they have a familiarity with them and, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has said, time is of the essence.

We have heard from Mr. Moulton of the Brookings Institution, and others who have full knowledge of such subjects, that there are in the present labor forces 65,000,000 men and women, including our soldiers, of whom there will be 11,000,000 coming back seeking jobs some day. We know that we have a tremendous public debt growing out of this war that can only be serviced if we have high and constant employment and free industry. If we are going to keep the national income sufficient to service our public debt and the other demands of Government we shall have to keep employed somewhere between 53,000,000 and 55,000,000 men and women.

We have no time following this war to search about and audit a dollar here or a dollar there. We have to again trust the abilities of those Government servants who have already made the contracts to terminate them.

This bill that has been given so much study provides adequate methods, adequate safeguards by which contracts can be terminated, the machinery that was used for the war effort moved out of the plants and peacetime machinery brought in, the business of peace recommenced, and jobs given to the returning soldiers and the present members of our labor force who wish to continue in their present pursuits.

How can this evolution be financed? What banker would want to make loans to these industries if he thought some other department of government might step in 2 or 3 years hence and post-audit the whole situation and say, "Here, there was a mistake made."

No, this is one of the greatest economic evolutions this country has had since we converted from peace to war. Now we have to take that next great step and convert from war back to peace. This bill will provide the methods and safeguard the American taxpayers, and I heartily back it. I hope it will be passed.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay my respects to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], who is the able and distinguished chairman of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee. As chairman of that committee he has been most cooperative and has driven the committee day in and day out to get this legislation before the House of Representatives.

May I also say a few words in regard to another member of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who is in reality the author of the termination-of-contracts bill. He is one of the ablest and best lawyers in the House of Representatives. He has given his undivided time for the last month to considering the details of this highly important legislation. Both of these gentlemen deserve much credit for the time, effort, and energy they have put into shaping the pending bill.

I hope the House will follow the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] because they

are deserving of it in every respect and have given unselfishly of their time and abilities in trying to formulate the very best and most workable bill for the Congress to adopt.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. As a member of the subcommittee, may I add a word in tribute to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] on the energy he has displayed and the sound common sense he has given to all these problems?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MADDEN, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BLACKNEY, for 4 days, on account of death in family.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some remarks I made in connection with the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

IRELAND, AN INDEPENDENT NATION

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes in connection with a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I preface my remarks by reading the resolution.

Joint Resolution requesting the President to use his good offices with the Prime Minister of Great Britain for the purpose of obtaining immediate and complete independence for the Irish Free State.

Whereas recent events in the European theater of war present an opportunity for a demonstration of faith in the Atlantic Charter; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter declares that it is the national policy of the United States and Great Britain to respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and

Whereas the granting of full and complete independence to the Irish Free State would

result in a definite alignment of such state, as a free and independent nation, on the side of the United Nations; and

Whereas united action by the nations favorable to the Allied cause is essential to the winning of the war and the destruction of Nazism and its Japanese counterpart: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is requested to use his good offices with the Prime Minister of Great Britain to the end that the Government of Great Britain shall immediately grant, in conformity with the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, full and complete independence to the Irish Free State.

Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent to every friend of the Allies that the neutrality of Ireland served not alone as a protection to the people of Ireland, but a safeguard to English and American troops quartered in Ireland. It must be remembered that Ireland if subjected to air attack could be destroyed almost in a day and that lacking the defensive weapons with which to combat an attack any course other than the one taken would be suicidal and indefensible.

The fact stands clearly forth that despite broken promises of independence in every crisis for 700 years; in this war as in World War No. 1 the Irish people have done their full part to make victory possible for the Allied cause.

In the present war with a population of less than 3,000,000, or about one-half as great as New York City, Ireland has furnished upward of 250,000 men in the combat service and an equal number in war industries or one-sixth of the total population.

Provided America contributed in the same proportion we would be required to furnish for combat service 11,500,000 men.

It must be understood that in addition to the 250,000 furnished by Ireland direct there are many millions of Irish descent today serving with honor and distinction from every portion of the world where her scattered sons may be found.

It has long been the contention that religious differences prevented the establishment of an Irish Republic and that the rights of the non-Catholic element of the population would not receive just consideration. The lie was given this assertion when Douglas Hyde, a Protestant, was chosen President of the Free State Government of Ireland unanimously although the population was two-thirds Catholic.

Under his brilliant leadership with the return of peace and an independent republic, there is assurance of an Irish renaissance that may yet cheer, charm, and contribute to the cultural advancement of the world.

The concluding chapter is yet to be written, but so long as the destinies of Ireland continue in the hands of men as devoted and unselfish as Eamon de Valera, Cosgrave, Douglas Hyde, and countless others whose names shine out like beacons, there is a certainty that not only will a united Ireland be possible in our day, with a condition similar to that which obtains in our own country—no

North, no South, but a united land and the epitaph written that Ireland has taken her place among the nations of the world. It will indeed be a period of rejoicing for every individual with Irish blood in their veins, a rejoicing based on the knowledge that the last great advance in the far-flung movement of the handful for the freedom of Ireland has been accomplished in the same manner as was the conversion of Ireland by St. Patrick, without the shedding of a drop of blood.

The things that are beautiful, the things of the mind and heart and soul we have inherited from our race, we must bring to lay upon the altars of our new and beloved country, as our contribution to her greatness and glory.

Let us cherish the graces and virtues of the race that is ours; let us pray that peace and its noble fruitage may be the lot of the old land. The American Irish have given generously of their substance and services to Ireland in the past that she might win her right to sit in the hall of nations, free and unfettered.

Here is our country, America, with her problems calling to us for the best we have in us, and here we must help to solve them with a service that must not be divided. Our duty is here—our responsibility is here. The fate, the fortune, and future of our country and our homes are involved in the way we respond to the call of our country and our response must never be timid or faint-hearted.

I can say with pride the Irish have given America good and unselfish services in the past and that they stand ready today and always to march with her and for her into the future that lies ahead, ready to face all hazards and meet all eventualities for her security and honor unafraid.

The cradle of our race we should recall with affection and tenderness, with love and sentiment, and make her memory the inspiration for our duty and the spur for our service to the land we live in, the greatest Nation upon the face of the earth—our own United States of America.

The futility of persecution and oppression is perhaps more abundantly proven in the case of Ireland and its people than in the case of any other country or people in the history of the world. Notwithstanding a program of savagery that would shame the wild Indian of the western plains of early days, the people of Ireland have remained faithful to the teaching of St. Patrick and loyal to the principles of liberty. No darker page has ever been written in the history of the world than that which was written by Oliver Cromwell, whose sole purpose apparently was the extermination of the Irish race. The atrocious and horrible character of his infamy is forcibly brought home to a traveler who has occasion to visit the island of Haiti. With a view to the destruction of the race, Cromwell shipped 50,000 boys and girls, between the ages of 12 and 18, to the island of Haiti. Those who survived the voyage and the climate were required in the course of time to marry Negroes,

constituting the population of Haiti, and a visitor even at the present day will find Negroes with skin as black as any African Negro speaking with a brogue and bearing the names Murphy, O'Brien, McCarthy, and Sullivan, and other names prominent among persons of Irish extraction.

Not content with persecution of such atrocious character as to put to shame either Nero or Herod, the Irish people were subjected to engineered famines with the result that a population at one time in excess of 12,000,000 is today less than 3,000,000. The singular feature has been that, regardless of persecution or oppression, nearly every generation has contributed to the list of martyrs and every decade has produced its group of intellectuals, not swashbucklers but courageous, gallant men who, like their forebears were not afraid to die in the sacred name of liberty and for the honor and glory of the land of their fathers. The list is exceedingly large, but on an occasion of this character we would be remiss in an obligation and duty if we failed to direct attention to those who have made luminous the pages of Ireland's history, preserving by their courage and leadership, faith and principle.

We have Rory O'Moore, 1576, and in 1641 his namesake, Roger O'Moore, and 1778 Henry Grattan, in 1798 the valiant Wolfe Tone, and 1803 the martyred Robert Emmett, followed by that great leader, Daniel O'Connell, through whose genius, without the firing of a shot, Catholic emancipation was secured for the people of Ireland; the brilliant John Mitchell in 1848, and the talented James Stevens in 1865; the parliamentary genius Charles Stewart Parnell in 1881, and the recent martyrs to Irish independence on Easter Sunday in 1916, Sheehy Skeffington, Thomas McDonough, Patrick Pearce, James Connelly, Sir Roger Casement, and others.

The persecution and oppression and war of extermination against Ireland by the British Empire has been the most potential factor to the development of liberty and free government in the world. The wild-geese followers of Sarsfield scattered throughout the world by a decree of Cromwell shed luster and made luminous the pages of the history of every land which they graced with their presence and sword. Every pledge and every promise made to the Irish people through seven centuries of control by Great Britain has been callously violated.

When the American Revolution broke out, the restrictions upon Ireland were removed and Grattan at the head of 80,000 men in open revolt was lulled into the belief that Ireland's wrongs were to be righted, but, the war over, witnessed the return of the jailer and the enactment of laws even more oppressive than those which formerly existed. During the Napoleonic wars Ireland was again promised home rule and permitted to enlist to save the Empire; and at Waterloo, the Iron Duke of Wellington, an Irishman, defeated Napoleon; and again the Irish were rewarded by the restoration of the shackles, and return to their accustomed place—Ireland.

Yes; from Waterloo to the Crimean Peninsula; from the cotton bales of New Orleans under the Irish Andrew Jackson; from Cedar Creek under the Irishman Sheridan to the field of Appomattox, under Grant; from Khartoum to Peking; from India to South Africa; from the dust of the unnumbered dead there arises like incense a demand for the absolute independence of Ireland.

There were many Americans of Irish extraction who were loud in their condemnation and protest of the insurrection in Dublin in 1916, but personally I do not believe there was justification for protest upon the part of any right-thinking American, since the insurrection in Dublin in 1916 did not differ either in purpose or principle from the insurrection in America on April 19, 1775, and men with Irish blood in their veins might well hold their heads in shame were it not for the fidelity and the courage of the group of intellectuals responsible for the revolt of 1916, which compelled the granting by the British Government of the autonomous form of government now enjoyed by Ireland.

It has been my privilege recently to visit Ireland for the first time and to marvel at the progress that has been made in a short period of 15 years. The one- and two-room houses are disappearing, giving way to modern, healthful places of habitation, and more school-houses have been erected in 15 years under the Free State Government than during the seven centuries of British misrule. The men constituting the Dail in Ireland are the equal if not the peers in intelligence of any legislative group to be found in the world. They are sincere, unselfish, patriotic, devoting time, energy, and talent to the welfare of the people and the land which they have been chosen to govern. They are making genuine progress and are still idealists.

We have been accustomed to regard Ireland in the past as the land of saints and scholars. Perhaps a little might be said of the artistic side of the race. It has been my privilege to visit both Trinity College and Dublin Museum and to gaze upon the Book of Kells, the most beautiful example of book illuminating ever produced in the history of the world, and produced eight centuries before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. To gaze upon the chalice of Ardagh, the cross of Clonmacnoise, and the Bell of Patrick, the most wonderful examples of the art of the silversmith ever produced, and turned out in the seventh century. Yes, when the rest of the world was wandering down a blind alley in despair Ireland was keeping alive the torch of Christianity and civilization and culture of which we in America have been the beneficiaries.

The constructive character of Ireland's contribution to America's progress and prosperity has unquestionably been greater than that of any other race, but, unfortunately, too little attention has been given this phase of Irish progress, and too much attention has been bestowed upon other phases.

We have been prone to take such pride in the martial achievements of the Irish

as to cause the impression to become deep-rooted that in their prowess as a fighting people alone have they been of value. It is not my purpose to detract from the tremendous contribution to American history by gallant men of Irish blood, but, if possible, to clear the atmosphere of the impression that they have been purely a one-sided people. As soldiers, statesmen, poets, inventors, and orators they have been a contributing factor to human progress. As soldiers, even prior to the conception of liberty in the Colonies, they had achieved fame, and it is pleasing for American citizens of Irish blood to rejoice in those achievements which make luminous the pages of the Republic's history.

It is gratifying to know that the ember igniting Liberty's torch emanated from that distinguished Irishman, whose fiery utterances furnished the text which resulted in the Republic's birth, when, as a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, those prophetic words were uttered: "As for me, give me liberty or give me death." Patrick Henry.

The evacuation of Boston by the British and armed resistance at Bunker Hill was in a large measure due to the ammunition and arms secured through the daring of Capt. John Sullivan in consequence of the capture of Fort William and Mary, December 11, 1774, more than 4 months before the shot was fired at Lexington and "hear 'round the world."

As Americans of Irish blood visiting our northern neighbor, Canada, it is most interesting to gaze at those rugged heights, rising almost perpendicular from the St. Lawrence, and there find inserted a bronze tablet sacred to the memory of the first general who died in the struggle for liberty, and but for whose untimely death, in all probability, Canada would today be under the American flag, General Montgomery.

Ships were necessary to combat the mighty power of England and it remained for Michael O'Brien of Machias, Maine, with his six sons, to capture an English convoy, and, in return for their signal act of gallantry, for the Continental Congress to christen the first ship of the American Navy, *Liberty*, and the second ship *Hibernia*, the first in command of Jack O'Brien, the second in command of his brother Jerry O'Brien, and the Navy in command of that dauntless hero, whose service to America has only recently received due recognition at the Capitol in Washington, the first commodore of the American Navy, John Barry.

It is pleasing to us as men of Irish blood, proud of our American citizenship, to know that the great "Father of our Country," Gen. George Washington, on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, 1776, placed in command of the Continental forces at Dorchester Heights, Gen. John Sullivan, and the password on that memorable occasion which marked the departure of vested British tyranny and oppression from these shores was "St. Patrick."

Much stress has been laid for nearly a century upon the contribution of the French people to American liberty, and

it was indeed a tremendous contribution and one worthy of a great people, but let it not be forgotten that the Irish regiments in the service of France pleaded that they might be selected, because of an hereditary hatred of the English, to serve under Washington and that prominent among the regiments were the regiment de Dillon, the regiment de Walsh, and the regiment de Lacey, made up wholly of the descendants of that Spartan-like band known as the wild geese who, rather than serve under the conquering Cromwell, took service under the colors of France.

The most courageous document ever known in the world's history was the Declaration of Independence, and it is pleasing for us to know that Charles Thompson, an Irishman, was secretary at the first meeting of the Continental Congress and continued in that capacity until, at the close of the war, Washington tendered him his sword when liberty had been secured; that among those men who signed the Declaration of Independence 10 were of Irish blood; that 142 of the Minute Men who fought at Lexington and Concord were Irish and of those who participated in the Battle of Bunker Hill, 228 were of Irish blood; that the White House at Washington was designed by William Hogan, and is an exact reproduction of the home seat of the Duke of Leinster, near Dublin, Ireland; that the seat of our National Government was originally the farm of Daniel Carroll, brother of Charles Carroll, signer of the Declaration of Independence, who, at the conclusion of the war, tendered his farm as a seat for the American Government; that the figure of Liberty which surmounts the National Capitol was designed by the Irishman, Crawford, and that the Congressional Library with its matchless mosaics, its fairy-like colorings, its incomparable marble staircase, stands as a monument to the ability, the honesty, and the honor of its designer, an Army engineer named Casey.

Every great privation visited upon the Irish people has proven a blessing in disguise for America. Persecution and oppression in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries furnished America with valiant sons and pure daughters, inured to poverty, born to privation, and eminently fitted for the blazing of a broad highway to progress and liberty in a new and strange land.

The famine of 1848 marked the beginning of a stream of immigration such as has seldom been witnessed in the history of any land. From 1848 to 1870, more than 2,500,000 Irish men and women came to these shores, not the infirm and the decrepit but the staunch and sturdy manhood and the wholesome and pure womanhood, the flower of Ireland, and these were the men that aided in making possible Grant's campaign in the Wilderness, Sherman's march from Atlanta to the sea, and Sheridan's master stroke at Cedar Creek. They were lovers of liberty first and Ireland second.

What a wonderful heritage is ours when we contemplate the character, the

courage, and the manhood of these mighty men.

Picture the gallant Gen. Michael Corcoran on the occasion of the visit of Prince Albert to America in 1860, ordered by the Governor of New York to do escort duty with his regiment, and the manly Corcoran dashing his sword to the ground, stating "I refuse to do honor to the representatives of a government that for seven centuries has persecuted and oppressed my race," and for this utterance the Sixty-ninth Regiment disbanded by order of the Governor of New York.

Then picture Fort Sumter fired upon and the gallant American general, Corcoran, tendering the Governor of New York the services of the Sixty-ninth Regiment in defense of the Union, and this regiment later welded into that fighting machine of imperishable memory, the Irish Brigade, first under Corcoran, and later under the immortal general, Thomas Francis Meagher, adding fresh laurels on every bloody field to the Stars and Stripes of our country until, in 1864, when the fighting was most severe, historians tell us the Irish Brigade in that year captured more flags and standards than the remainder of the Union Army combined and never lost one flag or standard.

We may well say with him who honored both the land of his birth and the land of his adoption, the lamented O'Reilly:

No treason we bring from Erin—nor bring we shame or guilt,
The sword we hold may be broken, but we have not dropped the hilt.
The wreath we bear to Columbia is twisted of thorns, not bays;
And the songs we sing are saddened by thoughts of desolate days.
But the hearts we bring for freedom are washed in the surge of tears;
And we claim our rights by a people's fight, outliving a thousand years.

The chaste, humble, and Christlike life of St. Patrick and his teachings are the most treasured heritage of the Irish people. They have proven an adamant-like force in the pathway of materialism, atheism, and chaos in the life of this Republic. They stand for the purity of womanhood and for the sanctity of American home life, and there is no method by which their benefit and blessing to this Republic may be gaged.

The poet priest of the Southland Father Ryan, spoke with a voice of prophecy when he wrote the poem *A Land Without Ruins*.

A land without ruins is a land without memories—a land without memories is a land without history. A land that wears a laurel crown may be fair to see; but twine a few sad cypress leaves around the brow of any land, and be that land barren, beautiful, and bleak, it becomes lovely in its consecrated coronet of sorrow, and it wins the sympathy of the heart and of history. Crowns of roses fade, crowns of thorns endure, Calvaries and crucifixions take deepest hold of humanity, the triumphs of might are transient, they pass and are forgotten, the sufferings of right are graven deepest on the chronicles of Nations.

Yes, give me the land where the ruins are spread
And the living tread light on the hearts of the dead;

Yes, give me a land that is blest by the dust,
And bright with the deeds of the down-trodden just.

Yes, give me the land where the battle's red blast,
Has flashed to the future the fame of the past.

Yes, give me the land that hath legends and lays
That tell of the memories of long vanished days;

Yes, give me the land that hath story and song;
Enshrine the strife of the right with the wrong.

Yes, give me a land with a grave in each spot,
And names in the graves that shall not be forgot;

Yes, give me the land of the wreck and the tomb;
There is a grandeur in graves—there is glory in gloom;

For out of the gloom future brightness is born,
As after the night comes the sunrise of morn;

And the graves of the dead with the grass overgrown
May yet form the footstool of liberty's throne,

And each single wreck in the war path of might
Shall yet be a rock in the temple of right.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Claude R. Whitlock, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 16, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Saturday, June 17, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4968, a bill to amend section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, relative to deposit of vessel proceeds received from the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Persons desiring copies of the printed hearings when available will please notify the clerk by letter.

Witnesses are requested to notify the clerk by letter at least a day in advance of the hearing of their desire to testify, in order that a list of witnesses may be prepared. Written statements for the record from persons other than witnesses should be submitted a day in advance.

Amendments to be proposed during the hearing should be submitted to the reporter in duplicate.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will meet on Wednesday, June 21, 1944, at 10:30 a. m. on all resolutions providing for temporary admission of political and religious refugees.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1657. A letter from the Director, the Office of Defense Transportation, Office for Emergency Management, transmitting a copy of Budget Bureau form for quarterly estimate of personnel requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1658. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1945, ending September 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1659. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1660. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 15, 1944, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 680); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1661. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4615. A bill to establish, for the investigation and control of tuberculosis, a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy. First report pursuant to House Resolution 465, Seventy-eighth Congress, by the select committee investigating post-war military policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5025. A bill to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4958. A bill to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO. Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2969. A bill to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of United States courts and United States marshals; with amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Phoebe Sherman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCHILL of New York:

H. R. 5026. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Missouri:

H. R. 5027. A bill to provide for the deferment in each calendar year under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 of not less than 6,000 medical students; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5028. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5029. A bill to assist in the internal development of the Virgin Islands by the undertaking of useful projects therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5030. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5031. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act of 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5032. A bill to provide for the submission of administrative regulations and orders to the Congress, and for the approval by Congress of those which should be continued in effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5038. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARE:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution making appropriations for grants to States under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution requesting the President to use his good offices with the Prime Minister of Great Britain for the purpose of obtaining immediate and complete independence for the Irish Free State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. Res. 598. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to make a survey of the need for a system of airports and landing areas throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 5033. A bill for the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 5034. A bill for the relief of the estate of Francis A. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5035. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Kraemer and the estate of Michael J. Kraemer; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 5036. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Pascual Lopez; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Fannah A. Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

5858. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing the enactment of Senate bill 1385 introduced by Senator Aiken, of Vermont, for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5859. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petitions of residents of Long Branch, N. J. and Red Bank, N. J., petitioning Congress to adopt the Marcantonio resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5860. By Mr. GILLETTE: Petition of 335 residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania in opposition to House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or distribution of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5861. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima, Wash., urging consideration of House bill 2082, prohibiting manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5862. By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who changest not in a world so rocked and shaken, so filled with lamentation and clamor, a world swept by the whirlwind and riven by the earthquake, we would find the peace of Thy presence and of the still, small voice. In our dire need steal Thou upon our troubled spirits like the vesper calm of lingering twilight, like the gentle dew on parched ground; commission us as the servants of Thy righteous will and fit our spirits for that high role in this time on ages telling. Save us from the tragic mistakes of the past. Make us architects of a statelier temple of humanity where no child of Thine shall be kept back from the common altar of fellowship and where all kindreds are one before Thy searching eyes. As the fires of war are quenched give us the wisdom so to build that never again in blind folly will we choose foundations which are sinking sand and walls of tinder which will prove but rubble for the devouring flame. We pray in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 15, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 6 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4837. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the suspension in part of the processing tax on coconut oil; and

H. R. 4967. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2711) for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GILLETTE) laid before the Sen-

ate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

FREE PORTS FOR EUROPEAN WAR REFUGEES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter and resolution which I have received from Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, of the Congregation Beth Israel, and Mr. Maurice Hartman, president, Hartford, Conn.

The resolution urges the establishment of "free ports," whereby temporary haven may be provided for European refugees.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGREGATION BETH ISRAEL,
Hartford, Conn., June 14, 1944.
The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg to transmit to you the enclosed resolution, which has been adopted by the Congregation Beth Israel, and we bespeak your earnest support of the matter dealt with therein.

Cordially yours,

RABBI ABRAHAM J. FELDMAN.
MAURICE HARTMAN, President.

America was founded by refugees—by refugees fleeing from religious persecution and racial bigotry. This great Nation, conceived in liberty, has been peculiarly sensitive to the cry of its brothers' blood wherever and whenever they have been enslaved and persecuted. Particularly because of its deep religious heritage and character, believing that men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—among these being liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and, above all, life—America has been the traditional haven of those who have been robbed of these precious possessions.

The hour has come when America must once again rise to this, her manifest destiny, when the God who led our early founding fathers to this richly dowered land is calling upon us to "bring forth the prisoner from the prison house and those that dwell in darkness from the dungeon."

We commend the President of the United States for his leadership and vision manifested in championing the cause of the afflicted, not only by words but by forthright deeds. Especially timely has been his recent creation of the War Refugee Board, which has already evidenced its sincere determination to rescue as many as possible of those victims of Nazi-ism otherwise marked out for wholesale slaughter in the plan of "free ports" advocated by the War Refugee Board, whereby temporary haven may be provided for those who would otherwise be murdered to the last man. We agree that America can do no less for these, our allies and fellow foes of Nazi-ism, than we do for our enemies who, as prisoners of war, are provided with at least such temporary sojourn and security. We appeal to the conscience of America to respond immediately to this suggestion of the War Refugee Board, and we call upon our Representatives in Congress, as well as upon all our fellow citizens, to save the lives of thousands, and even hundreds of thousands, otherwise destined for mass extermination, by setting up at once such "free ports," such islands of temporary rescue, upon the free and cherished soil of America.